THE ROLE OF

IMAM MUḤAMMAD AL-BĀQIR

IN EARLY ISLAM

by

Arzina E. Lalani

(nee Sunderji)

Thesis presented for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy.

University of Edinburgh

- February 1988 -

EX BIBL. UNIV. EDINBURGH

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED TO

HE WHO INSPIRED ME TO

UNDERTAKE THE STUDY OF

ISLAMIC HISTORY.

DECLARATION

This is to declare that the thesis has been composed by myself.

Signed:

(ARZINA EL-NASIR LALANI)

CONTENTS

(i) DEDICATION

(ii) ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

(iii) ABSTRACT

(iv) ABBREVIATIONS

(v) TRANSLITERATION

1. INTRODUCTION:

   (a) Social and Cultural Background
   (b) Survey of Shīᶜite Sources

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND : IDEA OF THE IMAMATE UNTIL AL-BĀQIR'S TIME

   (a) Early disputes about the leadership of the Community.
   (b) Al-Ḥusayn and Karbalā'
   (c) The aftermath of Karbalā'
   (d) Kaysānīya

3. ASPECTS OF AL-BĀQIR'S LIFE AND CAREER

   (a) The laqab al-Bāqir
   (b) The waṣīya of al-Bāqir
   (c) Rivals of al-Bāqir
   (d) The controversy regarding his wafat

4. AL-BĀQIR'S VIEWS ON THE IMAMATE:

   (a) Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate
   (b) Traditional basis of the Imamate
   (c) Theology of the Imamate

5. SOME THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF AL-BĀQIR

(a) Īmān
(b) Taqīya
(c) Qaḍā' wa al-Qadar
(d) The Unity of God

6. AL-BĀQIR IN TRADITIONIST CIRCLES:

(a) Non-Shīᶜite circle
(b) Shīᶜite circle
(c) Shīᶜite associates

7. AL-BĀQIR'S CONTRIBUTION TO FIQH:

(a) Madhhab ahl al-Bayt

(b) Some of the legal problems mostly common to the three Shīᶜite groups, the Zaydīya the Ithnaᶜasharīya and the Ismāᶜīlīya:

(i) Mashᶜala al-Khuffayn
(ii) Nabīdh
(iii) Al-Jahr Bismillah
(iv) Mutᶜa al-hajj
(v) Adhān
(vi) Qunūt
(vii) Salāt al-Janāza

CONCLUSION

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To begin with, I would like to express my deepfelt gratitude to my family, especially my parents and my husband to whom I am indebted not only for the moral support but also for the financial assistance they gave all throughout my years of study. I am also thankful to the Institute of Ismā^{c}īlī Studies for their scholarship as well as for the constant encouragement from its various staff and scholars.

I would also like to express my appreciation to all those people who helped and advised me at the onset of my research. In this cconnection, my special thanks go to Dr. Jasim Hussain, Dr. ^{c}Azmi al-Sayyid, Dr. Dhi^{c}a M. Siddik, Dr. Marzouq Tenbak and Dr. Mu^{c}aibed.

To my supervisor, Dr. Ian K. A. Howard, I owe special gratitude not only for supervising this work with such keenness but also for guiding me correctly in the early stages of my research. Thanks are also due to the other members of saff in the department of Islamic and Middle Eastern Studies, especially the secretary Miss Irene Crawford, whose smiling countenance and good words always cheered a new student.

I must also render my thanks to Prof. W. Madelung of Oxford University, Prof. A. Hamdani of Wisconsin University, Prof. Muhsin Mahdi of Harvard University, Prof. M.M. Ayoub of University of Toronto, Profs. D. Little of McGill University, Prof. S. H. Nasr of the University of Pensylvania and Prof. A. Duri of the University of Jordan for their help and advice on additional sources. In this connection I offer special thanks to Prof. Madelung who unhesitatingly let me have the use of his personal microfilms for a long period of time.

I am also grateful to the librarians and staff of the various universities in the country, particularly University of Edinburgh, University of Leeds and the Institute of Ismā^{c}īlī Studies who all proved very helpful in answering queries and in obtaining the necessary books, periodicals and manuscripts.

To several of my friends and relations, Mr. Shainoor Rashid, Miss Gulnar Karmali, Mrs. Shainool Jiwa, and especially my in-laws, Mrs. Zarina Lalani and Miss Yasmin Lalani, I am extremely grateful for their help, support and understanding. My sincere thanks are also due to Mrs. Tina Wigley and Miss Lesley McLean who typed this thesis with commendable accuracy.

Finally, I must acknowledge the debt I owe to my husband, my twin boys and my little girl without whose patience, understanding and sacrifice I do not think this work would ever have been finished. I must not, however, forget to mention God's guiding-hand in this respect.

ABSTRACT

The present study is devoted to the role of Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir in early Islam. The first introductory chapter gives a brief social and cultural background of the period in which al-Bāqir lived and surveys the Shīᶜite sources. The second chapter is a historical background dealing with the idea of Imamate until al-Bāqir's time. The third chapter looks at some aspects of al-Bāqir's life such as his laqab, his waṣīya, his rivals and the controversies regarding his death-dates.

Chapter four investigates al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate from Qur'ānic point of view as well as from the traditional angle. It also deals with some of the concepts which al-Bāqir put forward such as naṣṣ, ᶜilm, nūr, iṣma and others. The fifth chapter discusses some of the theological views current at the time of al-Bāqir, topics such as Īmān, taqīya, qaḍā wa al-qadar and the unity of God.

The second last chapter studies al-Bāqir's image as a traditionist both, among the non-Shīᶜite circle as well as the Shīᶜite circle. The chapter also includes some of al-Bāqir's more popular associates. The final chapter discusses al-Bāqir's contribution to fiqh which involves the foundation of the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt as well as advice to his followers and others on some legal problems amidst the varying interpretation of different scholars.

ABBREVIATIONS

BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
BSOS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies
EB	Encyclopaedia Britannica
EI^1	The Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st edition
EI^2	The Encyclopaedia of Islam, new edition
IC	Islamic Culture
IQ	Islanic Quarterly
JA	Journal Asiatique
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBBRAS	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JPASB	Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
MW	Muslim World
REI	Revue des études Islamiques
SI	Studia Islamica

TRANSLITERATION

The system of transliteration in this work follows in general the method of the Library of Congress as outlined in the Cataloguing Service Bulletin, 49 (december, 1958) except for the two diphthongs ـيّ and ـوّ where instead of the usual iyy and uww, I have preferred to use īy and ūw.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

It has been generally assumed that al-Baqir led an inconspicuous life from the point of view of history.[1] Scholars have not only doubted his achievements and thereby his success, but, they are even suspicious whether he claimed the Imamate for himself.[2] This study seeks to examine the above claims and looks at al-Bāqir's contribution not only from the Shīᶜite angle but also from the general Islamic point of view.

In order to appreciate al-Baqir's role and influence more clearly, an historical background about the idea of the Imamate until his time has been given. This is followed by some aspects of his life and career which includes a discussion about his popular laqab al-Bāqir and a section on his waṣīya, after which his position in relation to his rivals is examined together with the controversy regarding his dates of death.

---

1. Donaldson, Shīᶜite Religion, p.119.

2. Watt, W. M. " Shīᶜism under the Umayyads" JRAS (1960) pp. 168ff.

The next chapter looks at al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate with Qur'ān and Ḥadīth as the bases. In defining his theory of the Imamate he puts forward certain pre-requisites so that some sort of order could be brought into the otherwise confused concept of Imamate that had then emerged amongst the various rival groups. The following chapter looks at al-Bāqir's contribution to some current theological issues of the period such as īmān, taqīya, qaḍā wa al-qadar and the unity of God.

The second last chapter studies al-Bāqir's image as a traditionist (muḥaddith), both among non-Shīᶜite and Shīᶜite circles. This chapter also includes a section on his Shīᶜite associates. The final chapter looks at al-Bāqir's role as a faqīh who gave advice and guidance to his followers as well as others amidst the varying interpretations of the different groups at the time.

The above discussions form the main element of this study. However, it will be appropriate to give a general survey of the social and cultural background of the Islamic empire during al-Bāqir's period. This will help to provide a better picture of his contribution to that period and also give some idea of the environment and circumstances of the period in which he lived.

Social and Cultural Background to al-Bāqir's period

Al-Bāqir happened to live at a very crucial time in Islamic History. Not only did al-Bāqir witness the vast extension of the Islamic empire, he also saw the Arabicization of the state administration, the introduction of purely Arab coinage as well as the development of a postal system. It was also during this period that many architectural monuments such as the Dome of Rock in Jerusalem and the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus were built and adorned.

It seems, also, that the study of the Qur'ān was a principal concern of Muslims. A little earlier in order to preserve the Qur'ānic text from corruption, steps were taken to establish a more adequate script as well as rules of Arabic grammar. The first attempts for these were made in Kūfa and Basra as it was there that the need was first felt. Medina, however, continued to be regarded as the centre of religious learning where the foundations of studies connected with the Qur'ān were laid.

The interpretation of the Qur'ān also necessitated a careful study of its grammatical structure and

vocabulary. This gave rise to the twin sciences of philology and lexicography.[1] The manner in which Qur'anic passages were applied was based on recollections of actions or sayings of the Prophet that had some bearing on the subject of the text. Rules for conducting the daily life and affairs were also sought in the practice of the Prophet (sunna); thus there came into being the science of Tradition (ḥadīth). The study of the Qur'ān and hadith formed the bases upon which the study of kalām (theology) and fiqh (jurisprudence) were built.[2].

Al-Bāqir, thus, happened to live at a time when the various scholars were pursuing these studies and even travelling far and wide in search of traditions. These traditions necessarily included much historical material, mainly with regard to the Prophet's military expeditions (maghāzī) as well as other aspects of his life (sīra). Alongside this, there also began to appear accounts of early Islamic historical material.

By the time al-Baqir succeeded his father in c.94 A.H., the various schools of law had begun

---

1. Gibb Arabic Literature p.39. See for more details Hitti, P.K. History of the Arabs, 10th edition (Hong Kong 1985) Reprint.

2. Hitti, op.cit. p.242: Also see Gibb, op.cit.

arguing over diffferent juridical issues; the traditionists opposed the jurists regarding the position of the sunna of the Prophet and the exegetes gave varying interpretations of Qur'anic ayats, all apparently based on Prophetic traditions. Furthermore, serious theological discussions also took place among the scholars on topics revolving around the Imamate, topics such as īmān and Islam, qaḍā' wa qadar and other such related subjects which had obvious political undertones. Therefore, it is also during this period that we may trace the rudiments of many of those religio-philosophical movements and religio-political sects within Islam such as the Qadarīya, the Murji'a and the Khārijīya who formed the earliest religio-political sect. The Shīᶜa, one of the two camps into which Islam split on the issue of the Imamate also took definite form during al-Baqir's period.

Ironically, it was also during this period that the twin cities of Mecca and Medina, especially Mecca, were transformed into centres of luxury and wordly pleasure where wealth and singing girls from the conquered lands poured in. This led many people to indulge in past-times like chess, backgammon, dice and other luxurious habits such as drinking and gambling. With such an atmosphere it was not long before poetry began to reassert itself, especially that

of the sensual type such as that of ᶜUmar b. Abī Rabīᶜa in Mecca and Jamīl in Medina.

Undoubtedly, the pious people were disturbed at the state of affairs in which society had sunk in. They detested especially the rulers who by leading a luxurious life themselves not only set an example to others but also gave the license which religion forbade. Another area of widespread dissatisfaction was the way in which society was roughly divided. The ruling class was formed by the caliph's family and the aristocracy of Arab conquerors. Then came the neo-muslims who were clients (mawālī) to some of the Arab tribes. This was a status which they bitterly resented and their espousal of the Shiᶜite cause in Iraq and the Kharijites in Persia was one way in which they expressed their dissatisfaction. Thirdly, there were the non-Muslims i.e. Christians, Jews and others known as dhimmis for the tribute they paid in return for protection (dhimma) and then lastly, at the social ladder, stood the slaves.

Thus during the period in which al-Bāqir lived, groups of Muslims denounced the Umayyads and at the same time placed before the people some hope for liberation which they said could only be achieved through a divinely-inspired leader. Most people believed that this leader al-mahdī, the rightly guided,

could only come from the Prophet's family, the Ahl al-Bayt. This led many members of the Prophet's family to exploit the situation and a variety of competing organizations appear each claiming some connection with the Prophet's family.

Survey of Shīᶜite sources:

In this study, as well as the standard Islamic sources, particular attention will be paid to Shiᶜite sources which have not received as much attention from scholars. An attempt has been made to include Shīᶜite sources of all persuasions, - Zaydī, Ithnā ᶜAsharī and Ismāᶜīlī, particularly the last two. Among Zaydī sources, one particular manuscript has been extensively used in this study especially in the chapter on 'Al-Bāqir's contribution to fiqh.' This is the Amālī Aḥmad b ᶜIsā of Muhammad b. Manṣūr al-Murādī[1] which contains many traditions of al-Baqir reported by Abū al-Jārūd on different juridical issues such as the adhān, prayer, qunūt, divorce, zakāt, the rites of pilgrimage (manāsik al-ḥajj) and other miscelleanous aspects of fiqh. Besides the Majmūᶜ al-fiqh attributed to Zayd b. ᶜAlī, other Zaydī sources have been used but mainly from quotations provided in W. Madelung's Der Imam al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen (Berlin, 1965) and C. Van Arendonk's Les Dẽbuts de L'Imamat Zaidite au Yemen (Leyden, 1960).

---

1. Ambros. H. 135 Gall.

As far as Ithnā^{c}Asharī sources are concerned the earliest extant works are collections of hadith known as uṣūl (sing. aṣl). These are supposed to consist of utterances of an Imam which are committed to writing for the first time, sometimes directly from the Imam and sometimes on the authority of a hadith scholar. The number of uṣūl is usually estimated at 400, of which only thirteen are known to have survived in manuscripts. Their contents include traditions of a historical, doctrinal, legal, anecdotal and polemical nature.[1]

At a later stage, these various uṣūl, most of which are attributed to the disciples of Imam Ja^{c}far al-Ṣādiq[2], were incorporated into larger works known as jawāmi^{c}, which in turn served as sources for subsequent Shi^{c}ite works. Among Shī^{c}ite Ithnā ^{c}Asharī

---

1. al-Uṣūl al-arba^{c}a mi'ah (Tehran, 1371) Dānishgāh No. 962 Zayd al-Zarrād K. al-Aṣl(f.1b-9a); ^{c}Abbād al-^{c}Usfurī K.al-Aṣl (f.9b-12a); ^{c}Āṣim b. Humayd al-Ḥannāt K.al-Aṣl (f.12b-25a); Zayd al-Narsi K. al-Aṣl (f.25b-35a); Ja^{c}far b. Muḥammad b. Shurayh al-Haḍramī K.al-Aṣl (f.35b-48b); Muḥammad b. al-Muthanna al-Haḍramī K. al-Aṣl (f.49a-57a); ^{c}Abd al-Malik b. Ḥākim K. al-Aṣl (f.58b-59b); Muthanna b. al-Walid al-Ḥannāt K.al-Aṣl (f59b-61b); Khallād al-Sindī K.al-Aṣl (f.61b-62a); Al-Ḥusayn b. ^{c}Uthmān b. Sharīk K. al-Aṣl (f.62b-65a); ^{c}Abd Allah b. Yahyā al- Kāhilī K.al-Aṣl (f.65a-66b); Salām b. Abī ^{c}Amra al-Kūfī K. al-Aṣl (f.66b-68a); ^{c}Alī b. Asbāṭ K.al-Nawādir (f.68a-74b).

2. See E. Kohlberg in Cambridge History of Arabic Lit. p.301.

compilations, a unique position is occupied by those concerned with the virtues and prerogatives of the Imam. The earliest of these to have survived is the Baṣā'ir al-darajāt of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī (d. 290/963). It is believed that in the above work, al-Ṣaffār included many of the sayings from a document (ṣaḥīfa) which the Prophet had dictated to ᶜAlī.

Many of the traditions found in the Baṣā'ir were incorporated by Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad b. Yaᶜqūb al-Kulaynī (d.329/941)[1] in his major work al-Kāfī fi ᶜIlm al-Dīn which is divided into three parts : al-uṣūl, al-furūᶜ and al-rawḍa. It is the uṣūl and furūᶜ which are relevant to this study. Al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī encompasses in its two volumes the doctrine of the Imamate in the form of numerous traditions dealing with the necessity of an Imam and belief in him as prerequisite to faith, the Imam's knowledge and other theological aspects of the Imamate. It also contains sections on merits of knowledge, the concept of tawhid, belief and heresy, Qur'ān and prayers as well as a section on social relations. The furūᶜ contains the basic doctrine of law where

---

1. Al-Ṣaffār was an important rāwī of al-Kulayni. See for more details Ivanow, W. The Alleged Founder who has a chapter on al-Kāfī and its author pp.11ff including his rawis.

emphasis is laid on the religious aspects of law, the <u>ᶜibādāt</u>.

A work that is rarely used by scholars is the <u>Ithbāt al-Waṣīya</u> attributed to al-Masᶜudi (d.346 A.H.). He describes the transfer of the ruling authorities and the religious testament of the ancient patriarchs from generation to generation since the creation of Adam. Another work that also has traditions on the nature of the Imamate as well as on other theological issues is the <u>Risāla al-Iᶜtiqādāt al-Imāmīya</u> of Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī Ibn Bābawayhī (d.381/991) which is translated by Aṣaf A.A. Fyzee under the title: **A Shīᶜite Creed.**[1]

In addition to traditions regarding the Imamate, there are numerous others dealing with the virtues of ᶜAlī, the first Imam and his right to rule. These are grouped together under titles such as <u>Khaṣā'iṣ</u>, <u>Manāqib</u> or <u>Faḍā'il</u> ᶜAlī. Among many such works may be mentioned the <u>Khaṣā'iṣ Amir al-Mu'minīn</u> of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusayn al-Sharīf al-Rāḍī (d.406/1015).[2] The

1. Published for the Islamic Research Association by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press (Calcutta 1942).

2. The Sunnī author al-Nasā'ī (d.303/916) also has a similar work by the same title. He was one of the many non-Shiᶜite writers to collect traditions on cAlī's virtues.

biography of ᶜAlī and other Imams has been dealt with by the renowned scholar and theologian, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Nuᶜmān al-Shaykh al-Mufīd (d.413/1022) in his <u>K. al-Irshād</u>.[1] Al-Mufīd is also the author of the <u>K. al-Jamal</u> which contains traditions relating to the battle of Camel (36/656). Another work referred and used in this study are the sermons attributed to ᶜAlī in the <u>Nahj al-Balāgha</u> as collected by al-Sharīf al-Rāḍī.[2]

An invaluable source of traditions is provided by early Shīᶜite Qur'ān commentaries. One such work is the <u>Tafsīr al-Qummī</u> of Abū al-Ḥasan ᶜAlī b. Ibrāḥīm al-Qummī (d.c. 307/919). This <u>Tafsīr</u> contains much historical material related to the <u>Sīra</u> but hardly pays any attention to linguistic problems and ignores many difficult Qur'ānic passages, perhaps due to its polemical nature. Al-Qummī's first transmitter, Abu al-Fadl al-ᶜAbbas b. Muhammad b. al-Qāsim, incorporated into the work traditions from the <u>Tafsīr Abū al-Jārūd</u>[3] otherwise referred to as the <u>K. al-Bāqir</u>

---

1. This work has been translated by I. K. A. Howard.

2. There are numerous Pakistani translations of this work. One among them is by M.A.Salmin (Lahore, n.d)

3. See E. Kohlberg in <u>Cambridge History of Arabic Lit</u>. p.306.

by Ibn al-Nadīm.[1] This is the Qur'an commentary which Abū al-Jārūd Ziyād b. al-Mundhir transmitted from Imam al-Bāqir. The other later famous Qur'ān commentaries are al-Tibyān fi tafsīr al-Qur'ān of Abū Jaᶜfar al-Ṭūsī (d.460 AH) and the Majmuᶜ al-bayan fi tafsīr al-Qur'ān of al-Faḍl b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭabrisī (d. 548/1153). These commentaries also contain many traditions although their main concern is with legal, linguistic and doctrinal problems.

Besides the Uṣūl al-arbaᶜu - mi'ah and the Furūᶜ min al-Kāfī mentioned earlier on, Shīᶜite traditions of a legal nature are also found in the Man la yaḥdurūhu al-faqīh of Ibn Bābawayhi and Abū Jaᶜfar al-Ṭūsī's Tahdhīb al-aḥkām and al-Istibṣār. In fact legal traditions are also found in al-Ḥimyarī's Qurb al-isnād which is earlier than al-Kulayni's al-Kāfī. Another earlier work which has a section on jurisprudence is the K. al-Maḥāsin of Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khālid al-Barqī (d.274 A.H.). Al-Barqī is also the author of the Kitāb al-Rijāl in which he has listed the followers of the various Imams. Later writers have commented upon these traditions, of which one of the most popular is the Waṣā'il al-Shīᶜa ilā aḥādith al-Sharīᶜa by Muḥammad by al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥurr al-ᶜĀmilī

---

1. Fihrist, trans. by Dodge, I, p.75.

(d.1104/1693).

The other sources for Shīᶜite traditions are works known as the Amālī. These are dictations taken down by the pupils from their shaykhs. As these Amālī were usually dictated at a number of successive sessions (majālis, sing. majlis) these works sometimes may be referred to as majālis as well. Several such works have come down from prominent scholars like Ibn Bābawayhi, al-Mufīd, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and Abū Jaᶜfar al-Ṭūsī. The traditions in these works are not grouped according to any specific themes; rather they relate to different issues such as historical, doctrinal and legal.

Another useful work is the ᶜUmdat al-Ṭālib, a Shīᶜite genealogical work by Aḥmad b. ᶜAlī, known as Ibn ᶜInaba (d.825/1422). He is quite well informed regarding the early Shīᶜite movements.

Another important source material for the early Shīᶜite period is preserved by later Shiᶜite writers in their voluminous works. Among them may be mentioned the Manāqib Āl-Abī Ṭālib of Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī Ibn Shahrāshūb (d.588/1192). Another prolific writer is Ḥasan b. Yūsuf Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (d.726/1325) who has written extensively on ḥadīth, theology and history. But perhaps the most famous and the

most useful is the encyclopaedic work Biḥār al-anwār by Muḥammad Bāqir b. Muḥammad Taqī al-Majlisī (d.1110/1700). Using a vast variety of Shīᶜite sources and scrupulously mentioning them, al-Majlisī's work provides valuable information on early Shīᶜite history, doctrine and tradition.

The fundamental work for Ismāᶜīlī source material is Ismāᶜīl b. ᶜAbd al-Rasūl al-Majdūᶜ's Fihrist[1] compiled during the second half of the 12th/18th century in India. Al-Majduᶜ describes the contents of about 250 works, classifying them into various branches and arranging them in progressive order according to the study of daᶜwa literature. W. Ivanow published a more comprehensive work, entitled, A Guide to Ismaᶜili Literature[2] based mainly on al-Majdūᶜ's Fihrist as well as on oral information derived from members of the Ismāᶜīlī community. A revision of this work was undertaken and published with some additions and omissions in 1963 under the title, Ismaᶜili Literature : A Bibliographical Survey.

However, the more recent work of Poonawala,

---

1. al-Majdūᶜ, Fihrist al-Kutūb wa al-Rasā'il, ed. N. Munzawi, (Teheran, 1966).

2. (London : Royal Asiatic Society, 1933).

Biobibliography of Ismāᶜīlī Literature[1] is undoubtedly an invaluable compendium and a major contribution to Ismāᶜīlī Studies. This work lists and locates all the Ismaᶜili works, printed as well as in manuscripts that are known to exist. Like Carl Brockelmann in his Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur, Poonawala also describes each author and his works, giving dates of the authors where known with some biographical details as well. In addition he also provides a list of sources for the author's life and works.

One of the earliest Ismāᶜīlī works that has been particularly useful in this study is the K. al-Zīna of Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d.c. 322/934-5), one of the earliest Ismāᶜīlī dāᶜīs.[2] The work itself is in a manuscript form and is divided into nine sections. The section that is of interest here is the seventh section dealing with muslim schools and sects and has been edited by an Iraqi scholar, al-Sāmarrā'ī in the appendix of his work al-Ghulūww.[3]

---

1. (California, 1977).

2. See for more details, Poonawala's Biobibliography, pp.36ff as well as A. H. Hamdani paper in "Acte Du XXI Congres International de Orientalistes" (Paris 1948), pp.291-94 who gives some details about the author and the work. Al-Rāzī is also the author of other works such as K. al-Iṣlaḥ, and Aᶜlam al-Nubūwwa both of which fall outside the scope of this study.

3. (Baghdad, 1972).

Another early Ismāᶜīlī writer whose various works have been extensively used in this study is the famous al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān (d.363/974), a brilliant and versatile writer who appears equally at ease writing history, theology or law. Among his various works is the Sharḥ al-Akhbār which is a manuscript in 16 parts. The first eleven parts deal with ᶜAlī, his delegation from the Prophet, his role in the battles, his struggle against the various rebels, his qualities and other aspects of his life. Part 12 deals with Hasan and Husayn, and part 13 which is more essential to this study mentions the battle of Karbalā' and those who died there moving on to the delegation of authority to Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn. He then gives some details of the Imam's life and circumstances before moving on to al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq. In each case he gives some details about the happenings that occurred during these Imams' times.[1] Parts 14, 15 and 16 give some reports on Imams, Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq, Imam Ismāᶜīl, Imam Muḥammad b. Ismāᶜil and al-A'imma al-Masturīn until the time of al-Mahdī but provides more details on the Alids who preceded al-Mahdi in his claims to the Caliphate.[2]

---

1. See A. S. Tritton (and P. Kraus), "Notes on some Ismāᶜīlī Manuscripts" BSOS, 7 (1933).

2. For more details on the contents of each of the sixteen parts in four volumes, see Majdūᶜ Fihrist 69-72. Part I has been printed by al-Jamicᵃ al-Sayfiya. (Surat, India).

Another work of al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān which is also in a manuscript and which proved useful is the Manāqib li Ahl al-Bayt wa al-Mathālib Banī Umayya. According to Ivanow[1] this work was compiled earlier than the Sharḥ in which he used extracts from the Manāqib. A comparison of the section dealing with al-Bāqir proves this to be true. However, in the Manāqib some additional and useful information is given about the history of the Umayyad period since in the above work he compares the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt with the faults of the Banū Umayya.

Yet another work of al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān used here is the K. al-Iḍāḥ. It is or was one of the earliest and most comprehensive works on fiqh. However only a portion of it on ṣalāt has survived.[2] It begins with traditions of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq on the merits of the prescribed prayer and the approach towards it. Then follows a detailed discussion on how to determine the exact time for each prayer. After that there are traditions on various aspects of the prayer such as the inclusion of the formula Ḥayy ᶜala khayr al-ᶜamal in the adhān, the adhān itself and Iqāma, the

---

1. Ivanow, "Early Shīᶜite Movements" JBBRAS 17 (1941) p.4.

2. See for more details Poonawala's Biobibliography pp.51-52. I have used the microfilm of the Tubingen manuscript given to me by Prof. Madelung.

mosque and its rules of conduct. Then, there are traditions about one who leads the prayer, about the merits of reciting the ᶜishā' and the fajr prayers in congregation as well as about what suras (actually suwar) may be said or recited in the prescribed prayers.

Among the various printed works of al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān that have been extensively used in this study is the Daᶜā'im al-Islam in two volumes.[1] It is worth mentioning that there is a fundamental distinction in Ismāᶜīlī literature between ẓāhirī knowledge and bāṭinī knowledge. The former comprises of fiqh, history, admonition, manāqib, faḍā'il and other related areas while the baṭinī knowledge consists of ta'wīl and haqā'īq.

As for the Daᶜā'im itself, it follows the usual pattern of other works on Islamic fiqh with the exception of the theory of walāya, (allegiance and devotion to the Imams) and the subject of ṭahāra or religious purity. The latter is of course a speciality of all Shīᶜite fiqh but for the Ismāᶜīlis in particular ṭahāra has an esoteric meaning signifying love and

---

1. See for more details regarding the manuscripts, editions and translation, Poonawala, Biobibliography pp. 56-7.

devotion to the Imams.[1] The corresponding esoteric works for the Da^{c}ā'im are al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}man's Ta'wīl al-Da^{c}ā'im and the Asās al-Ta'wīl, both of which have been edited.[2]

Still another work of al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān is the kitāb al-himma fi atbā^{c} al-a'imma[3] which deals primarily with the subject of the Imamate. It also gives an ethic or code of conduct for the believers as well as refutes ghulāt ideas and argues that ghanīma is "everything acquired by man", a fifth of which belongs to the Imams. Yet a work of al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān is al-Urjūza al-Mukhtāra[4] where he explains the idea of the Imamate and other related aspects in a poem. It is basically a work of polemics and refutation. There are quite a number of other works of al-Qāḍī on other subjects especially fiqh, such as al-Urjūza al-Muntakhaba, Mukhtaṣar al-Īḍāḥ, K. al-Iqtiṣār, k.al-Yanbū^{c}, Mukhtaṣar al-Āthār and

---

1. Da^{c}ā'im al-Islam I, pp.121-158; al-Majālis al Mustansiriya, pp.40-43 and Tāj al-^{c}Aqā'id, p.51

2. See for more details the Biobibliography of Poonawala pp.63-64.

3. The work was first edited by M. Kāmil Husayn but I have used the one edited by Mustafa Ghālib (Beirut, 1979).

4. Edited by Ismā^{c}īl K. Poonawala.

ikhtilāf uṣūl al-Madhāhib.[1]

The earliest esoteric work which contains some useful information is the Asrār al-Nuṭaqā' of Sayyid-na Jaᶜfar b. Manṣūr al-Yaman, a contemporary of al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān. The Asrār al-Nuṭaqa is closely connected with his other work the Sarā'ir al-Nutaqā' and appears to be a revised and amplified version of the latter. The Sarā'ir deals with the esoteric interpretations of the stories of the great prophets and ends with the ta'wīl of Sūra al-Masad. The Asrār appears to be a verbatim copy of the Sarā'ir with some additions and omissions. One of the additions is a section on "Shiᶜite sects after the death of Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq." In this work the author also mentions that 120 yeas have elapsed since the "disappearance" of al-Ḥasan al ᶜAskarī which was in 260 A.H. Therefore, it is possible that either the second work compiled around 380 A.H. was later ascribed to Jaᶜfar b. Manṣūr al-Yaman[2] or that the author was not the son but the grandson of Ibn Hawshab, ibn signifying a descendant rather than a son.[3]

---

1. For details about the manuscripts and editions of these works, ref. Poonawala's Biobibliography pp.52-54.

2. Poonawala, Bibliography, p.72

3. Ivanow, Rise of the Fatimids, p.18

Jaᶜfar b. Manṣūr al-Yaman has written a number of other works and is considered one of the leading exponents of ta'wīl. Many of his works such as the kitāb al-farā'iḍ wa ḥudūd al-dīn containing esoteric interpretations of sura Yūsuf, Kahf and Nūr are still in manuscript form. Others such as the K. al-Kashf are edited. An interesting work that is ascribed to him is the kitāb al-fatarāt wa al-qirānāt. This work which deals with the prophecies and occult sciences believed to have been revealed by ᶜAlī is also known as k. al-Jafr of Mowlana ᶜAlī b. Abī Ṭālib.[1] Still another interesting work of his is the Shawāhid wa al-Bayān also in a manuscript which contains ayats referring to ᶜAlī and his successors.

Two other brilliant writers of the period were Abū Yaᶜqūb al-Sijistānī (d. 386-393 A.H.) and Ḥamīd al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ᶜAbdAllah al-Kirmānī, both of whom have written numerous works. Among Sijistānī's many works may be mentioned the Ithbāt al-Nabuwwa the Kitāb al-maqālid, the Kitāb al-Yanābīᶜ and many others.[2]

---

1. See Poonawala's Biobibliography pp. 70-75 for more details regarding this as well as other works of the author.

2. See for more details about al- Sijistānī and his other works Poonawala, Biobibliography, pp. 82ff. For the contents of these works, see al-Majdūᶜ, Fihrist and Ivanow Guide to Ismāᶜīlī literature and his Ismāᶜīlī Literature : A Bibliographical Survey.

Al-Kirmānī (d.c. 412 A.H.) too, wrote a number of works among which are the Rāḥat al-ᶜAql, the Kitāb al-Riyāḍ, al-Aqwāl al-Dhahabīya the Maᶜāṣim al-Huda[1] and al-Maṣābiḥ fī Ithbāt al-Imama.

Another work that has been used in this study is the Risāla fi al-Imama by Abū al-Fawāris Aḥmad b. Yaᶜqūb (d.413 A.H.).[2] This consists of answers given by him to various questions put to him concerning the Imamate.

Al-Mu'ayyad fī al-Dīn al-Shirāzī (d.470 A.H.) was yet another learned scholar of the Ismāᶜīlīs whose many works are mostly in manuscripts except the Sira al-Mu'ayyad and the Diwān al-Mu'ayyad, both of which have been edited by M. Kāmil Ḥusayn. Some excerpts of his great work, al-Majālis al-Mu'ayyadīya,[3] consisting of eight hundred majālis in eight volumes are found in M. Ḥārithī, Majmūᶜ al-tarbīya while some of his majālis are summarised by Muscati and Moulvi in their Life and Lectures of al-Mu'ayyad.

---

1. This work which is in a manuscript and only the second half of which is extant is a refutation of al-Jāḥiẓ's K. al- ᶜUthmāniya. See Poonawala Biobibliography p.98 and al-Majdūᶜ Fihrist pp.95-96 For other works of Kirmānī, see Poonawala op. cit and al-Majdūᶜ op.cit.

2. This work has been edited and translated with notes by S.Makarem under the title The Political Doctrine of the Ismāᶜīlīs.

3. The Majālis have been edited by Hamid ud-Din.

Another work of a slightly later scholar that has been used in this study is the <u>ᶜUyūn al-Akhbar</u> of Idrīs, ᶜImād al-Dīn (d.872 A.H.) which is in seven volumes. The volume most relevant to this work is the fourth one and has been edited by Mustafa Ghālib. It consists of biographies of the Imams after ᶜAli until the last Imam of the <u>Dawr al-Satr</u>. Idrīs has written many other works besides the <u>ᶜUyūn</u>, famous among which is his work on <u>haqā'iq Zahr al-Maᶜānī</u>. Some excerpts of this work are edited and translated by Ivanow in his <u>Rise of the Fatimids</u>.

CHAPTER TWO

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: IDEA OF THE IMAMATE UNTIL AL-BĀQIR'S TIME

a) Early disputes about the leadership of the Community.

Historical sources indicate that from the earliest times there was dispute about the succession to the Prophet. Several sources suggest that at least some people felt that ᶜAlī had a valid claim to succession. As early as the saqīfa, some people objected to offer allegiance to Abu Bakr saying that they would not give bayᶜa to anyone but ᶜAlī.[1] Why it was ᶜAlī, the sources do not mention and they also fail to explain why the Anṣār were willing to give up their own candidate, Saᶜd b. Ubāda for a compromise in favour of ᶜAlī who was obviously a Muhājir from the Quraysh. What is important from the historian's point of view is that historical reports which put forward such sentiments about ᶜAlī and his family are contained

---

1. al-Ṭabarī Ta'rīkh I p.1817; al-Yaᶜqūbī Ta'rīkh II pp.123 ff; Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt III ii 110,2. Also see such later sources as Ibn Athir al-Kāmil II p.156 and al-Suyutī, Ta'rīkh al-Khulafa' trans. Jarret (Calcutta, 1881) pp. 67-70.

in the earliest surviving historical material.[1]

There are reports which maintain that the voices raised in support for ᶜAlī's right did not subside after the decision taken in favour of Abu Bakr at saqīfa.[2] For, when the group came back to the mosque, there arose an unusual tumult in the gathering. In fact ᶜAlī, until then was not even aware of the decision. It is believed that at this point, ᶜAlī, with some of his supporters, both, from the Anṣār and the Muhājirūn, gathered at Fāṭima's house to ponder over the matter.[3] But, before any decision could be reached, ᶜAlī and his supporters were summoned to the mosque to pay homage.[4] It must be pointed out however that collection of traditions in the sources render it difficult to determine when exactly this demand for homage was made; whether it was immediately after they came to the mosque from the saqīfa, or whether it was after the burial ceremony of

---

1. It is claimed that even during the Prophet's life-time, there was a group deeply attached to ᶜAlī, who on that account came to be referred to as the Shīᶜa of ᶜAlī. See al-Rāzī, K.al-Zīna, p. 259 in al-Sāmarrā'ī's edition. Also see al Nawbakhtī al-Firaq p. 15.

2. al-Balādhurī Ansāb I pp. 579-91; al-Ṭabarī pp 1837-45; Ibn Hishām, IV, pp.307-10; Yaᶜqubī Ta'rīkh II pp.123-6.

3. Yaᶜqūbī II p.126

4. Balādhurī I p.582

the Prophet the next day when Abu Bakr was offered allegiance from the general public.

According to some reports[1] ᶜAlī and his supporters refused to go to the mosque at which point ᶜUmar is believed to have advised Abu Bakr to do the needful and that was to go in person and see what it was all about. Sources[2] suggest that thetwo men[3] marched to ᶜAlī's house with an armed party, surrounded the house and threatened to set it on fire if ᶜAlī and his supporters would not come to offer allegiance. ᶜAlī, it is believed, came out protesting about his own rights and refused to give in to their demands. The scene soon became violent[4] and ᶜUmar tried to push through the gate. However, at that moment, Fāṭima is believed to have appeared suddenly,

---

1. Balādhurī I, pp.585 ff; Yaᶜqūbī II, p.126; al-Ṭabarī I, p.1818.

2. ibid. All the above sources as well as al-Imāma wa al Siyāsa incorrectly attributed to Ibn Qutayba although quite an early work all give a detailed account of ᶜUmar and Abū Bakr's attack on Fāṭima's house as well as the force they exercised to secure ᶜAlī's homage. See also EI² art. "Fāṭima" where L. V. Vaglieri, comments regarding these events that "even if they have been expanded by invented details, they are based on facts."

3. al-Yaᶜqūbi Ta'rīkh II p.126. A report in al Balādhurī Ansāb I p. 585 Abū Bakr sent ᶜUmar and Zayd b. Thābit to ᶜAlī's house.

4. al-Yaᶜqūbī op.cit.

exclaiming;

> "Before God, I say, either you get out of here at once, or with my hair dishevelled I will make my appeal to God."

With this then, Abū Bakr's group left the place apparently without securing ᶜAlī's allegiance.[1]

There were a number of people who delayed offering allegiance to Abū Bakr but gradually, one after the other, became reconciled to the circumstances and offered him allegiance.[2] As for ᶜAlī himself, the traditions from the early times present a version of events that suggest that ᶜAlī opposed the pledge of allegance to Abū Bakr and felt that it should have gone to him. There is even a degree of unanimity although not total, that ᶜAlī delayed the pledge of allegiance until after Fāṭima's death though some late Shīᶜite scholars deny that he ever made the pledge.[3] Thus the evidence for his pledge in the preserved traditions is for delay rather than immediately.[4] Even the ones

---

1. al-Balādhurī I, pp.585 ff: al-Yaᶜqūbī II, p.126 al-Ṭabarī p.1818.

2. For details of names see Yaᶜqūbī II p.126 ff al-Balādhurī I, p.588.

3. Mufīd K. al-Irshād (trans Howard.) pp.116-137.

4. al-Balādhurī Ansāb I pp.585-6 strongly suggests that ᶜAlī delayed the pledge until after Fāṭima's death which was after six months. One of the reports is on the authority of ᶜĀ'isha.

which say immediately agree that he had to be sent for.

When ᶜAlī went with Fāṭima to ask Abū Bakr for her inheritance[1] he said that the Prophet had said, "I am of the company of the Prophets, we will not have people inherit from us what we have left of money dedicated to pious purposes." Fāṭima replied, "Is it then that you will be heir to your father and that I will not be heir to my father, for surely the Messenger of Allah said, 'A man will protect his child'?".[2] The dispute over this problem of inheritance reflects the dispute over succession. If the Prophet could leave property to heirs then there might be an argument for hereditary succession.

ᶜAlī, as is known, played a passive role in political affairs during the reign of the first two caliphs. This is quite revealing in comparison to his extremely active participation during the

---

1. Fāṭima claimed the estate of Fadak which her father had given to her unconditionally ashis share of the spoils of Khaybar. See EI² art "Fadak." Also see Ibn Saᶜd II pp.314 f; Ibn Hishām III pp.352, 368; Yaᶜqubī II p.127.

2. al-Yaᶜqūbī Ta'rīkh II p.127. Kumayt (d. 126 A H) in his Hāshimiyāt does not fail to mention this incident as to how Fāṭima was illegally deprived of her paternal inheritance especially Fadak and ᶜAlī's supreme authority.

Prophet's time. It is difficult to determine whether he abstained himself or whether he was actually excluded. The former would tend to suggest he was not happy with the way things were running while the latter would mean or imply he was a possible threat. In this connection there is a report that ᶜAlī declined Abū Sufyān's offer to fight for his rights, for in his view that would have meant destroying Islam.[1]

On his deathbed, Abū Bakr, having consulted ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān b.ᶜAwf and ᶜUthmān, nominated ᶜUmar as the Caliph[2], completely ignoring ᶜAlī, both in consultation as well as in nomination. This nomination was extremely disturbing and upsetting to some prominent companions of the Prophet and according to a report in al-Ṭabarī[3] Ṭalḥa personally complained about it to Abū Bakr. However,

---

1. al-Ṭabarī I p.1827; al-Balādhurī I, p.583.

2. Yaᶜqūbī II pp.136 f; al-Ṭabarī I p.2135. The choice of these two men is quite revealing in that first of all, none of them belonged to the Banū Hāshim and secondly, the branches of both these men, Banū Zuhra and Banū Umayya respectively had been great rivals of Banū Hāshim before Islam. Furthermore, both of them belonged to the wealthy circles of the Muslim Umma.

3. al-Ṭabarī I pp.2143-4; Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt III p.196 records a tradition saying that ᶜAlī and Ṭalḥa approached Abū Bakr asking him how he would answer God on the day of resurrection? Abū Bakr is said to have replied that he had appointed the best one among them.

Abū Bakr was adamant in his choice and made sure that this was there in writing.

As far as ᶜUmar's Caliphate is concerned, sources suggest that ᶜAlī had some major disagreements with him. Of special significance is the question of dīwān which involved many administrative and financial matters. ᶜAlī is said to have recommended the distribution of the entire revenue, without holding anything in reserve, a policy which ᶜUmar did not accept.[1]

Al-Ṭabarī[2] records an interesting dialogue between ᶜUmar and Ibn ᶜAbbās which suggests ᶜUmar's attitude towards the Banū Hāshim and especially ᶜAlī. According to this ᶜUmar is believed to have asked Ibn ᶜAbbās as to why ᶜAlī did not co-operate with them and that why did the Quraysh not support their family? When Ibn ᶜAbbās said he did not know the reason, ᶜUmar retorted, "it was because the Quraysh did not want both the Prophethood and the Caliphate to be combined in your house for that would make you rejoice

---

1. Vaglieri, art. "ᶜAlī" in EI^2. See also Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt III pp.212 ff in E. Sachau's edition (Leiden, 1904).

2. Ta'rīkh I, p.2796.

and feel arrogant."[1]

In nominating his successor, ᶜUmar restricted the choice to six people : ᶜUthmān, ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān b. ᶜAwf, Saᶜd b. Abi Waqqās, ᶜAlī, Ṭalḥa and Zubayr with his own son ᶜAbdAllah in the capacity of an advisor.[2] As is known, according to the reports, the six candidates were not given a choice but rather were forced and pressurized in partaking in the decision making body.[3] According to the Nahj al-Balāgha, ᶜAlī said that the very selection of Abd al-Raḥmān b.ᶜAwf as the deciding chairman ensured that the succession would not go to him.[4] ᶜAlī further suggested that this choice of ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān was a virtual guarantee for the nomination of ᶜUthmān who was his old friend and brother-in-law, whereas Saᶜd b.

---

1. Another version of the tradition has ᶜUmar telling Ibn Abbās that he was not aware of any other clan among the Quraysh to whom the verses of Zuhayr b. Abī Salma would be applied except the Banu Hāshim. This, he said, was due to their relationship and superior claims to the Prophet but the people did not want both the Prophethood and the Caliphate in their family for that would have made them rejoice and be proud. See Al-Ṭabarī I, p.2770 ff.

2. Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt III p.246 ff. See also al-Ṭabarī I p2778; al-Balādhurī Ansāb V p.16,18; al-Yaᶜqūbī II p.160.

3. See Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt III ii p.41-42.

4. See al-Shiqshiqīya : Nahj al-Balāgha I no.3 48-50. See also Howard's translation of Irshād pp.212-213

Abī Waqqās being ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān's cousin was bound to support him.[1] Traditions in al-Balādhurī[2] and al-Ṭabari[3] maintain that ᶜAlī protested about it but to no avail.

An interesting report which is recorded by al-Ṭabarī is that ᶜAlī was asked if he would rule according to the Sīra of the first two caliphs as well as the Sunna of the Prophet and Kitāb Allāh. ᶜAlī's refusal to do this indicates that he regarded the Caliphate in a somewhat different light than others.[4] ᶜUthmān accepted the conditions and was declared caliph by ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān.[5] Sources[6] suggest that ᶜUthmān's selection did not pass by with out serious protest from ᶜAlī's ardent supporters. ᶜAmmār b. Yāsir said:

> "O people, God has made us most honourable through this Prophet and distinguished us through his religion, but you are turning

---

1. al-Mufīd Irshād (trans. Howard) pp.210-211.

2. Ansāb V p.19.

3. Ta'rīkh (Annales) I p.2780.

4. One report in al-Ṭabarī I p.2778 goes so far as to mention that ᶜAlī refused to follow all three and said he would judge according to his own better judgment.

5. Ibn Sa'd Ṭabaqāt III ii pp. 42 ff; al-Balādhurī V p. 22; al-Yaᶜqūbi II p. 162; al-Ṭabarī I p. 2793.

6. Al-Ṭabarī I pp. 2785 ff.

> away from the people of the house (Ahl al-Bayt) of your Prophet."[1]

Miqdād's protest in favour of ᶜAlī was even stronger than that of ᶜAmmār. He said:

> "It is very hard to see how the people are paying their respect to the members of the family (Ahl al Bayt) of their Prophet after him. It is indeed shocking to see that the Quraysh have forsaken and by-passed the man who is the best among them."

Then someone asked Miqdād who were these Ahl al-Bayt and who was that man among them. Miqdad replied that "the Ahl al-Bayt were the Banū ᶜAbd al-Muṭṭalib and the man was ᶜAlī b. Abi Ṭālib."[2]

These statements demonstrate that support for ᶜAlī's claim had not died down, although it may have subsided for a while. With the coming of ᶜUthmān, as his kinsmen who occupied the governorships and leading posts, kept on behaving disgracefully and accumulating wealth, discontent soared high and many people looked towards ᶜAlī, besides those who had already initially supported him. According to al-Yaᶜqūbī, one of ᶜAlī's ardent supporters, Abū Dharr al-Ghafārī used to protest violently against ᶜUthmān's regime. He delivered speeches in the mosque of Medina in ᶜAlī's favour referring to him the waṣī of the Prophet and the wārith of his knowledge. He

---

1. Al-Ṭabarī I pp. 2785.

2. Al-Ṭabarī I p. 2786. See for a more detailed account of Miqdād's protest in Yaᶜqūbī II p. 163.

also invited the people whom he called the confused community (al-umma al-mutahayyira) to give preference to whom God had given preference and to set aside those whom God had set aside.[1]

There are clear indications that ᶜUthmān's attitude towards Abū Dharr was hostile. If such speeches were made it is hardly surprising. All sources agree that ᶜUthmān sent him away to Syria where he continued his campaign until Muᶜāwiya complained about his dangerous activities. ᶜUthmān then ordered him to be bound to a wooden camel saddle and sent to Medina under escort. Eventually, he was exiled to al-Rābdha, his birth place, where he died.[2]

The seething dissatisfaction in the empire eventually exploded into a revolt that ended in ᶜUthmān's assassination.[3] Amidst all the chaos and

---

1. al Yaᶜqūbī II p.171.

2. al-Balādhurī V pp.52ff; al-Ṭabarī I pp.285 8 ff. Masᶜudi Murūj II pp.339 ff; al-Yaᶜqubī II p.171ff. All these sources, except al-Ṭabarī also mention how ᶜAlī together with Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and ᶜAmmār b. Yāsir accompanied Abū Dharr to see him off and even talked to him, despite orders from ᶜUthmān to the contrary.

3. Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt III ii pp.50ff; al-Yaᶜqūbī II p.173. ff.

confusion, ᶜAlī became the Caliph, inheriting all its problems compounded by the murder of ᶜUthmān. He was acclaimed and hailed by many of his supporters and from what one gathers from al-Yaᶜqūbī,[1] the sentiments expressed by them on the occasion, show that a number of people conceded to ᶜAlī to have outstanding merits and superior claims to the Caliphate. Thus, according to al-Yaᶜqūbī, the spokesman of the Anṣār, Thābit b. Qays b. Shamās al-Ansārī paid him a glowing tribute saying:

> "Even though they preceded you in being leader yet they could not overtake you in religion;
>
> and even though they were ahead of you of you yesterday, today you have caught up with them.
>
> Neither you, nor they could conceal your position and nor were they ignorant of your status.
>
> They used to need you in what they did not know, while you, with your knowledge, do not need anyone."

Al-Yaᶜqūbī goes on to mention that another Anṣārī, Khuzayma b. Thābit, whose testimony was as well substantiated as that of two men (dhū al-shahādatayn) also stood up and after extolling ᶜAlī's faith and knowledge said:

> "You have what they have but they don't have what you have."

---

1. Ta'rīkh II p.179.

Yet another report in al-Yaᶜqūbī says that Ṣaᶜṣaᶜa b. Sawhān stood up to say:

> "Oh Commander of the Faithful, you have indeed adorned the Caliphate and not it you;
>
> You have raised its status and not it yours;
>
> The Caliphate needed you more than you wanted it."[1]

The pledge of Mālik b. al-Hārith al-Ashtar in al-Yaᶜqūbī appears unique in that he declared ᶜAlī as the waṣī al-awṣīyā' and wārith ᶜilm al-anbiyā'.[2] This shows that there was a group whose attitude towards him was different from the rest of the community.

The events that followed ᶜAlī's acclamation such as the rebellions of Ṭalḥa, Zubayr and ᶜĀ'isha as well as that of Muᶜāwiya and the secession of the Khārijites are too well known to need any elaboration. However, it is significant to note that in the battles that were fought, especially al-jamal and ṣiffīn, expressions such as waṣī were used as referring to ᶜAlī.[3] The poet,

---

1. Ta'rīkh II, p.179

2. al-Yaᶜqūbī Ta'rīkh II p.179.

3. See Ibn Abī al Hadīd, Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, edited by Abū al-Fadl Ibrāhim (Cairo, 1959), who has collected the verses describing ᶜAlI as such from Kitāb al-Jamal of Abū Mikhnaf apud. Jafri, Origins p.93. Another early writer, who quotes such verses is Nasr b. Muzāhim in his k. al Waqᶜāt al Ṣiffīn. See pp.18, 23f, 43, 49, 365, 382,385.

Abū al-Aswad al-Du'alī who fought by the side of ᶜAlī at Ṣiffīn accorded ascertainable religious honours to him when he said:

> "When I looked into the face of Abu al Husayn, I saw the full moon, which filled the spectators with reverent wonder.
>
> The Quraysh now know, wherever they may be, that thou art their noblest in merit and religion."[1]

If these reports are genuine statements of words spoken about ᶜAlī by these men then it would indicate that as early as ᶜAlī, these ideas were already part of what might be termed as the Shīᶜite tradition. Similar statements were attributed to the controversial figure of AbdAllah b. Saba[2] who is said to have declared, during ᶜUthman's reign that every

---

1. See Strothmann's art. on "Shīᶜa" in EI[1]. Cf. his art in SEI. Also Cf. Masᶜūdī's Murūj II p. 416 and Aghānī XII p. 329 in Dār al-Kutūb edition and XI p. 122 in Būlāq edition.

2. See EI[2] art. "ᶜAbdAllah b. Sabā." Also see the muslim scholar ᶜAlī al-Wardī who suggests quite strongly that the activities attributed to ᶜAbdAllah b. Saba were actually carried out by ᶜAmmār b. Yāsir whose nickname was also al-Sawdā'. See his Wuᶜāẓ al-Salāṭin (Baghdad, 1954), pp. 148 ff. apud. Jafri, Origins, p.86.

prophet had a wasī and that ᶜAlī was the wasī of Muḥammad, and had been designated as such by him. He is also believed to have taught that the divine spirit which dwells in every prophet passing successively from one to another was transferred from Muḥammad to ᶜAlī who bequeathed it to his descendants who succeeded him in the Imamate.[1] According to Nawbakhtī,[2] Ibn Sabā also preached that the first three caliphs and their followers should be cursed. He was also the first to preach the doctrine of waqf for he refused to recognize the death of ᶜAlī.

Such ideas suggest that there was a group which viewed ᶜAlī's succession as a matter of divine right rather than as merely political. This group was perhaps not necessarily known by any particular name at the time, although those who supported ᶜAli in the battle of the Camel and at Ṣiffīn, whether religiously or politically were all referred to as shīᶜat ᶜAli[3] or al-ᶜAlawīya as opposed to shīᶜat ᶜUthmān or more popularly al-ᶜUthmāniya.

---

1. al-Shahrastānī, K. al-Milal wa al-Niḥal ed. by W. Cureton, (London, 1946), p.132.

2. Firaq, pp.19-20.

3. It should be noted however that the name Shiᶜa was used for some people who were close to ᶜAli in the time of the Prophet. But it obviously did not imply a sect or a group. See al-Nawbakhti Firaq p.15 and al-Razi, K. al-Zīna, p.259 in al-Sāmarrā'īs edition.

b) Al-Ḥusayn and Karbalā'

When ᶜAlī was assassinated by a Khārijite, his son Ḥasan was acclaimed as the Caliph by the Kūfans. Muᶜāwiya, not only denounced the appointment both in speeches and letters, but also sent agents and spies to arouse people against Ḥasan. Sources[1] maintain that Muᶜāwiya was able to bribe Ḥasan's commanders which eventually led to his abdication. Ḥasan then left Kufa and settled in Medina where he is believed to have been poisoned by one of his wives, Juᶜda bint al-Ashᶜath who the sources suggest[2] was bribed to do so by Muᶜāwiya. Apparently this was necessary for Yazīd's succession which could not have materialised on account of the treaty that existed between Muᶜāwiya and Ḥasan.

Meanwhile a few Kufans gathered in the house of Sulaymān b. Ṣurad[3] and wrote to Ḥusayn to rise against

---

1. Wellhausen Arab Kingdom pp. 104-7 gives only a sketchy account of Ḥasan's abdiction using only al-Ṭabarī, al-Dināwarī and al-Yaᶜqūbī but al-Isfahānī in his Maqātil al-Ṭālibiyīn pp.46-77 and Shaᶜbān using Ibn Aᶜtham al-Kūfī's K. al-Futūḥ gives details of how Muᶜāwiya worked for Ḥasan's abdication. See EI² art "Ibn Aᶜtham" as well as Jafri's Origin from whom I have obtained the above information.

2. Isfahānī Maqātil p.73; Masūdī Murūj II p.426.

3. al-Yaᶜqūbī II p.228.

Mu^{c}āwiya but he refused to respond, honouring his brother's treaty. Quite a few people were perturbed at Ḥasan's abdication. One such person was Ḥujr b. ^{c}Adī al-Kindī who was untiring in his protest against Mu^{c}āwiya and the official cursing of ^{c}Alī from the pulpits that he had prescribed. Ḥujr and some of his associates revolted against Mu^{c}āwiya and his governor Ziyād b. Abihi.[1] Ziyād tried to persuade Ḥujr by every means including political concessions and material rewards but when he declined, he and his thirteen associates were rounded up. Seven of them were freed through the influence of their relatives while Ḥujr and six others were given the option of either being beheaded or saving their lives by publicly cursing and denouncing ^{c}Alī and giving good witness of ^{c}Uthmān.[2] When they refused to do that, they were executed. It is quite significant that Hujr and his associates paid for their lives because of their sentiments for ^{c}Alī.

---

1. Ziyād was initially on the side of ^{c}Alī's supporters but was won over by Mu^{c}āwiya who accepted him as his half-brother. He then appointed him governor of Kūfa and Baṣra after the death of Kūfa's governor al-Mughira b. Shu^{c}ba in 51-671.

2. al-Ṭabarī II pp.111-55; al-Balādhurī IV A pp.21 1-36. Aghānī XVII pp. 78-96. Already here the opinions about ^{c}Alī and ^{c}Uthmān are used to determine the tendency to which they belong. Later on judgments made on them and on the person of the first two caliphs served as a criteria for determining a person's tendency.

When Muᶜāwiya died and his son Yazid came to power in 60/680, Ḥusayn and two other people refused to pledge allegiance.[1] The numerous messages and letters from the people of Kufa and Basra mentioning that they had no Imam other than him led Husayn to attempt to gain power. He therefore sent his cousin Muslim b. Aqil to find out the true situation in Kufa and report to him.

In answer to the above letters and messages what Husayn wrote to the people of Kufa and Basra is quite revealing for it defines how an Imam should conduct his office as an Imam and also helps us to understand the concept of the Imamate as early as that.

بسم الله الرحمان الرحيم من حسين بن علي الى الملأ من المؤمنين والمسلمين اما بعد فان هانئا وسعيدا قدما علي بكتبكم وكانا اخر من قدم علي من رسلكم وقد فهمت الذي اقتصصتم وذكرتم ومقالة جلكم أنه ليس علينا امام فاقبل. لعل الله أن يجمعنا بك على الهدى والحق، وقد بعثت اليكم اخي وابن عمي وثقتي من اهل بيتي وامرته أن يكتبا الي بحالكم وامركم ورأيكم • فان كتب الي انه قد اجتمع رأي ملأكم وذوي الفضل والحجى منكم على مثل ما قدمت علي به رسلكم ، وقرأت في كتبكم انتم علي بيعتكم وشيكا أن شاء الله فلعمري ما الامام الا العامل بالكتاب والاخذ بالقسط والدائن بالحق والحابس نفسه على ذات الله • والسلام •

---

1. The two others were ᶜAbdAllāh b. ᶜUmar, and ᶜAbdAllāh b. al-Zubayr.

The following is the letter which Imam Ḥusayn wrote to people of Baṣra:-

امـــا بعـــد فان اللـــه اصـطـفـى محمـــدا صلعم على خـلقـــه واكـــرمـــه بنبـــوتـــه واختـــاره لـرســالتـــه ثـم قبضـــه اللـــه اليه ،وقـــد نصـــح لعـــبـــاده، وبلـغ ماارســـل بـــه صلعم وكنا اهـــلـــه واوليـاءه واوصياءه وورثته واحـــق النـــاس بمقـــامـــه فـــي النـــاس، فاستـأثـــر علينـــا قومـــنـــا بـــذلـك فرضـــينـــا وكرهـــنـــا الفـــرقـــة وأحـــبـــبنـــا العـــافـــيـــة، ونحـــن نعلم انـا احق بذلك إلـنـــحـــق المـــتـحـــق علينـــا مـــن تولاه ،وقد احـســنـــوا واصـــلـــحـــوا وتحـــروا الحـــق فـــرحـــمـــهـــم اللـــه وغفـــر لـــنـــا ولـــهـــم وقـــد بـــعـــثـــت رســـولـــي الـــيـــكـــم بهـــذا الكتاب وانا ادعـــوكـــم الـــى كتاب اللـــه وسنـــة نبـــيـــه صلعم ، فـــان الـــســـنـــة قـــد امـــيـــتـــت وان الـــبـــدعـــة قـــد احـــيـــيـــت وان تـــســـمـــعـــوا قـــولـــي وتطـــيـــعـــوا امـــري اهدكـــم ســـبـــيـــل الـــرشـــــاد • والســـلام علـــيـكـم ورحـــمـــة اللـــه •

In the above letters the first revealing aspect is that Ḥusayn does not use the word Shī^{c}a for them; instead he refers to them as mu^{c}minīn and muslimīn. This in turn is quite significant for he appears to be making a distinction between 'those who have faith' (mu^{c}minīn) and 'those who have only submitted' (muslimīn). He was probably referring to his committed followers when he wrote mu^{c}minīn and it is also worth noting that he addressed first the mu^{c}minīn and then the muslimīn. The other thing to observe is the fact that the Kufans invited him to go to them as they had no Imam to guide them. Furthermore, in the last two lines he describes how an Imam conducts himself i.e. "The Imam is none but one who follows the Book, is fair and just in his dealings, judges by truth and devotes himself to the service of God."[1]

In the letter to the Baṣrans, he appears more specific regarding his family's right to succession. He is also quite open about telling them that people preferred themselves over his family and himself,

---

1. al-Ṭabarī II p.235.

adding that even though they were more entitled to the leadership being the Prophet's ahl and awliyā' his awṣīyā' and wārith, they remained silent in order to to avoid dissension.[1]

Thus Ḥusayn is already defining the concept of the Imamate although only in an embryonic form to the people who have called him to them. However, before he reached Iraq, the enthusiasm to take up arms for him in Kūfa had already begun cooling on account of the severe measures taken by the governor. Ḥusayn met his death together with his small group at Karbalā' without the Kūfans doing anything to help him.[2]

c) The aftermath of Karbalā'

Ḥusayn's death aroused new movements in Kūfa. Many people expressed remorse for their apathy. They wanted to expiate themselves for it by throwing themselves into the struggle for seeking vengeance for Ḥusayn's blood. They chose Sulaymān b. Ṣurad al-Khuzā^{c}ī as their head and calling themselves the

---

1. al-Ṭabarī II, p.240.
2. C. Van Arendonk. Le Debuts, p.10.

tawwābūn (penitents) they bagan working secretly and accruing support.[1]

Meanwhile the traumatic experience of Karbalā' led Ḥusayn's son, ᶜAlī, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn to avoid political involvement as far as possible. When the Medinese rebelled against Yazīd in the year 63/681, Zayn al-ᶜAbīdīn left the city to go and stay on his estate in the outskirts of the city.[2] Later, when Yazīd's army led by Muslim b. ᶜUqba defeated the Medinese in the battle of Harra and sacked and looted the city, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn and his family were left unmolested. Moreover, there is evidence that he was exempted from giving allegiance to Yazid while all other Medinese were obliged to do so.[3]

By this time, the tawwābūn who had begun their activities secretly in Kufa had gathered enough support and were looking for a favourable occasion to do more work. Yazīd's death provided this opportunity. At this stage, al-Mukhtār b. Abī ᶜUbayd al-Thaqafī, who

---

1. Wellhausen, Die religiös-politischen Oppositionsparteren im alten Islam translated by R. C. Ostle and S.M. Walzer (Netherlands, 1975), pp.93 ff.

2. al-Ṭabarī II p.220.

3. Masᶜūdī Murūj III p.70; al-Mubarrad, al-Kāmil I p.260: Dīnawarī, K. al-Akhbār al-Tiwāl (Cairo 1960) p. 266.

had been in exile for his participation in the revolt in Kūfa under Muslim b. ᶜAqīl appeared in Kūfa and tried to persaud the tawwābūn to join him for a better chance of success.[1] But they refused and went ahead with their plans to meet at Nukhayla, a suburb of Kūfa in 65/684. However, only a quarter of those expected turned up. Full of guilt feelings, they prayed for the first three days and then proceeded to Karbalā making vows at the tomb of Ḥusayn.[2] The tawwābūn finally reached Ayn al-Warda and fought the Syrians zealously who far outnumbered them. Most of them were killed. Yet the movement itself was significant in that it was not only a purely religious movement but also a purely Arab movement i.e. the mawālī had not yet entered the scene.[3]

Meanwhile, in the Hijaz and Syria there was utter chaos and confusion. Muᶜāwiya II, who had succeeded his father Yazīd had died after only six months and Marwān b. al-Ḥakam had managed to become the new caliph. In the Hijaz, ᶜAbdAllāh b. al-Zubayr had already put forward his claims for the caliphate. In this struggle for the caliphate, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn

---

1. Wellhausen op.cit.
2. Van Ardendonk Le Debuts, p.10
3. Wellhausen, op.cit, pp.81ff.

maintained his non-involvement attitude.

As far as Kufa was concerned, although the tawwābūn had failed, there were still many Shī^{c}a there who wanted to do something. They found a willing leader in Mukhtār. According to the letter he wrote to the remnants of the tawwābūn he said he would base his policy on 'the Book of God, the Sunna of the Prophet, vengeance for "the family", defence of the weak and jihād against the evil doers.[1]

Sources suggest[2] that Mukhtār may well have offered to be an emissary of Zayn-al-^{c}Ābidīn. When he refused, Mukhtar began exciting Shī^{c}ite feelings in the name of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafīya,[3] claiming that he had been entrusted with avenging the shedded blood and ending injustice. This last aspect of injustice was taken up quite resolutely by him and in fact this brought him the sympathy of the mawālī who considered themselves

---

1. al-Ṭabarī II, pp.569 ff; Also see Watt, Formative Period, pp.44 ff.

2. al-Balādhurī V p.272; Mas^{c}ūdī Murūj III p.74.

3. ^{c}Alī's son from Khawla, a lady from the Banū Ḥanifa. See for more details F. Buhl's art. EI^{2} III, p.671.

deprived of the rights that they could claim as Muslims. On the other hand, the support of the mawālī alienated him from those who proclaimed the supremacy of the Arabs.[1]

In the meantime, Marwān had died and ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān who succeeded his father began strengthening his position. By this time Mukhtār had mobilized his forces as well and seized possession of Kūfa in 66/686-7. He even captured Mesopotamia as well as parts of the eastern provinces of the Umayyads.[2] When Mukhtār's army hunted down the murderers of Ḥusayn, although he was not propagating in Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn's name, he still sent Ubaydullah's head to him. After some time though Mukhtār's army became divided and one by one they were subdued by Musʿāb, the brother of AdbAllāh b. al-Zubayr. Mukhtār himself struggled for a while but later, he lost control and was eventually killed in67-8/687-8.[3]

For his part, Ibn al-Ḥanafīya is believed to have adopted an equivocal attitude towards Mukhtār's

---

1. Van Arendonk Le Debuts, p.10.
2. Ibn Saʿd V p.105
3. ibid.

represented at the pilgrimage of 71/638 by a personal flag. When he was addressed by the term Mahdī, he turned it into an innocuous meaning and told the people to address him as Muḥammad and Abū al-Qāsim.[1] The fact that he was imprisoned by Ibn al-Zubayr shows that he was a possible threat and therefore a potential candidate. When in prison, Ibn al-Ḥanafīya however had turned to Mukhtār for help and this shows that his attitude towards Mukhtār was not as passive and non-commital as some ~~sources~~ authors would have us believe.[2]

It is suggested that Ibn al-Ḥanafīya did have secret desings for the Caliphate because he had infact provisionally abstained from pledging allegiance to either Ibn al-Zubayr or ᶜAbd al-Malik in the hope that perhaps their rivalry might take a favourable turn towards him.[3] However, such a hope was rendered futile after the submission of Iraq and the fall of Ibn al-Zubayr in73/692. He was then

---

1. Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt V, p.94.

2. Jafri, Origins , p.240. Also ref. Wellhausen op.cit p.81. According to al-Wāqidī, Ibn al-Ḥanafīya had a very low opinion of what Mukhtār was doing while Ibn ᶜAbbās and the rest of the Banū Hāshim praised him highly when he sent them the head of Ibn Ziyād. See Ibn Saᶜd V, p.91 ff. Cf. F. Buhl's article on Muḥammad Ibn al- Ḥanafīya in EI[1].

3. Ibn Saᶜd op. cit. See also F. Buhl op. cit and Van Arendonk op. cit.

allegiance to either Ibn al-Zubayr or ᶜAbd al-Malik in the hope that perhaps their rivalry might take a favourable turn towards him.[1] However, such a hope was rendered futile after the submission of Iraq and the fall of Ibn al-Zubayr in73/692. He was then obliged to give allegiance to ᶜAbd al-Malik and in 78 A.H. even went to Damascus and gave some service to the caliph. In return the caliph rewarded him and his family with substantial subventions and also paid off his debts.[2]

The Kaysānīya

Out of the movement directed by al-Mukhtār there appeared a Shīᶜite tendency which is given the name Kaysānīya. This is a collective name used by hereseiographers for all the sects which evolved out of the movement of al-Mukhtār and traced the Imamate through Muhammad b.al-Ḥanafīya. Various explanations are given for this name, but it appears most probably to have derived from Kaysān Abū ᶜAmra, chief of the guard and leader of the mawālī under al-Mukhtār.[3]

---

1. Ibn Saᶜd op. cit. See also F. Buhl op. cit and Van Arendonk op. cit.

2. Ibn Saᶜd op.cit.

3. al-Ṭabarī, Ta'rīkh II, pp. 634ff; Dixon A.A. art. On Kaysān, EI² IV, p.836; Madelung, W. art. on Kaysāniyya, EI² IV, pp.836-8; Friedlaender I, "The Heterodoxies of the Shīᶜites in the presentation of Ibn Hazm," JAOS 28 (1907) 1-80 and 29 (1908),1-183, esp. 33 ff; Nawbakhti Firaq al-Shīᶜa, pp.20ff. For more details see Wadād al-Qadī, al-Kaysāniyya fi al Ta'rīkh wa al-adab, (Beirut 1974).

Kaysān is reported to have been more extreme than al-Mukhtār, charging the caliphs preceding ᶜAlī with infidelity, while al-Mukhtār condemned only ᶜAlī's opponents in the battles of the Camel and at ṣiffīn.[1] He is also alleged to have asserted that the angel Jibrā'īl transmitted divine revelations to al-Mukhtār, who could hear, but not see him. Further, he is reported to have claimed that Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiya was appointed by ᶜAlī as his executor (waṣī) thus excluding his brothers, al-Hasan and al-Husayn, from the Imamate. In Madelung's view[2] however, this doctrine was probably formulated later in opposition to Imamī and Zaydī denials of the rights of Ibn al-Ḥanafīya. Moreover, this was also contrary to the common view of the Kaysānīya who upheld the consecutive Imamate of the three sons of ᶜAlī.

The choice of the name 'Kaysāniya' was probably a pejorative nickname first applied by the opponents in order to discredit the movement,[3] but it also appears

---

1. Van Arendonk op.cit

2. Madelung, W. art. "Kaysāniyya" in EI^2, pp.838-8.

3. Friedlaender, op.cit Ibn Ḥazm IV, 94.2·179.20,180.7 17, 184.10-12. al-Ashᶜarī, Maqālāt. ed H. Ritter, (Istanbul, 1929-30), pp. 18-23; Baghdādī Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq, trans.by K.C.Seelye as Moslem Schisms and Sects, Part I,(New York, 1920), pp.27-38 al-Ṭabarī, vol.II, p.598ff; Masᶜūdī, Murūj 9 vols. (Paris, 1861-77), vol. V pp. 180ff; 226ff, 268, 475: VI, p.58; VII,p.117. al-Shahrastānī, K. al-Milal wa al-Nihal, ed. W. Cureton, (London 1946) p.109f.

to reflect the significance they attached to the mawla[1] element in it. The role of Kaysān seems to have been soon forgotten for the name was also explained as having been derived from the surname Kaysān which al-Mukhtār allegedly was given by ᶜAlī, or from the name of mawla of ᶜAlī killed at ṣiffīn from whom, it was claimed, al-Mukhtār got his ideas.[2]

It was presumably after the death of Ibn al-Ḥanafīya in 81/700 that messianic ideas about him began to spread. Some of his supporters called the Karibīya or Kuraybīya after their leader Abū Karīb [Kurayb] al-Darīr believed that Ibn al-Ḥanafīya had not died but was in concealment at Mount Rawda, west of Medina, nourished by springs of water and honey and protected by a lion and a leopard; that he would reappear as the mahdī at the appropriate time and fill the earth with justice as it was now filled with wickedness.[3] Among the people who were involved in this messianism, the

---

1. For more details on the mawlā element see Wellhausen, Opposition ..., pp. 87-95. Watt W.M. Formative period, pp.44-7; also JRAS 1960, Shīᶜism under Umayyads."

2. Nawbakhtī, op.cit, pp.20-1: Also Madelung's art. "Kaysāniyya," EI². p.836.

3. See Madelung's arts. "Kuraybiyya" and "Mahdī" in EI²

name of the poet, Kuthayyir (d.723)[1] is prominent. Similar to his views were those of another later poet, al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī (723-789).[2]

The Shīᶜite sources,[3] on the other hand maintain that Abū Karib and his followers were a distinct group from those who believed that he was hiding in the mountains of Raḍwā. According to them the whereabouts of Ibn al-Ḥanafīya could not be known and in their view ᶜAlī had named him the mahdī. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī maintains that for Abū Karib, Ibn al-Ḥanafīya was the immediate successor of ᶜAlī in the Imamate and opposed those who upheld the Imamate of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn before him.[4] This however was contrary to views expressed by the majority of the Kaysānīya who upheld

---

1. Ibn Qutaybā, K. al-Shīᶜr wa al-Shuᶜara', ed. M.J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1904), pp.216-29. Zubayr b. Bakkār Diwān al-Mufaḍḍalīyāt, ed. and tr. by C.J. Lyall (Oxford, 1918-21), vol. I, 174-7. Friedlaender JAOS 29, 38f. Ibn Khallikān ii. 529-35; also see Madelung, op cit and Watt Formative Period, pp.47-9.

2. Nawlakhtī, op.cit, p.26 f.

3. Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī K. al-Zīna (section on sects) in al-Sāmarrā'ī's edition p. 297; al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān, al-Urjuza al-Mukhtara ed. I.K. Poonawala (Montreal, 1970), pp.227-9. Nawbakhti, Firaq pp.25 ff. says that Ḥamza b. ᶜUmāra al-Barbarī was initially a follower of Abū Karib. Later he himself claimed to be a Imam and Prophet asserting the divinity of Ibn al-Ḥanafiya.

4. K. al-Zīna, p. 297.

the consecutive Imamate of the three sons of ᶜAlī.[1]

This appears to be the first occurence among Muslims of this kind, though later they came to be held by Shīᶜite groups in many forms. The similarity of these ideas to Judaeo-Christian messianic ideas is too obvious[2] to need further elaboration. The similarity is also with the ancient pre-Islamic Arabian tradition where it was believed that the hero would return.[3] Perhaps later this came to be believed that the hero would either return in the same body (rajᶜa) or in a different body (tanāsukh) having the same spirit.

Another group mentioned by Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī is the one which followed Ḥayyān al-Sarrāj[4] maintaining that Ibn al- Ḥanafīya had died in the Radwa mountains

---

1. Madelung, art. "Kuraybiyya" in EI^2.

2. For more details see Friedlaender, JAOS, 29,pp.36ff Also see Watt, Formative Period, passim; Ardendonk, op.cit. 10-15. Seale, M.S. Muslim Theology, a study of Origins with reference to the Church Fathers, (London 1964). For more details on the word Mahdī see the chapter on "The Expected Deliverer" in Themes of Islamic Civilization, ed. by John Alder Williams (Univ. of California Press, 1971), pp.189ff.

3. Hodgson, M.G.S., "How did the Early Shīᶜa become sectarian" JAOS 75 (1955) p.6.

4. According to Imami reports, he denied the death of Ibn al-Ḥanafīya during Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq's time. See Madelung's art. in EI^2, p. 837.

Imamate to his son, Abū Hāshim, who he knew would die childless. Still another group believed that Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya had died and that the Imam after him was his son Abū Hāshim whom he had appointed as his successor.[1]

All these different groups of the Kaysānīya are characterized by their love for ᶜAlī and his family and hatred towards the reigning dynasty. They were distinguished by the fact that they considered that their Imam who carried the name and kunya of the Prophet as the depository of a special knowledge and they venerated him to that effect.[2]

According to the Muᶜtazilite, Qāḍī ᶜAbd al-Jabbār,[3] some of the Kaysānīya after Ibn al-Ḥanafiya's death went over to Zayn alᶜĀbidīn. This would tend to suggest that among many of the Shīᶜa, ᶜAlī's family did not yet signify a single individual or for that matter Ḥusayn's descendants. It could well be that it was in

---

1. Ivanow,'Early Shīᶜite Movements', JBBRAS (1941) 17. Madelung'Kaysāniyya', EI²; Nawbakhtī, op.cit. p.27.

2. Van Arendonk, p.12-3 quoting Sibt Ibn al-Jawzī as citing a ḥadīth from the Musnad of Ibn Hanbal which had authorized ᶜAlī to give these names to a son. According to al-Zuhrī's explanation however this was only permission.

3. al-Mughni, Vol. 20 part II (Dār al-Masrīya n.d.) p.177.

[illegible] descendents. [illegible] these circumstances, that the doctrine of nass (designation) became a significant determinant of who the Imam was. This doctrine involved the idea of a pre-ordained ordinance which was given public reality by the formal act of the Imam designating his successor. The doctrine can be seen to be compatible with hereditary succession but it does not preclude the possiblity of the nass moving outside the hereditary chain, until specified.

The doctrine of the nass of al-Husayn on his son ᶜAlī, Zayn al-ᶜAbidin helps to confirm his Imamate to the exclusion of the sons of al-Hasan or any other descendants of ᶜAlī. However, at the time, since the concept of Imamate had not been laid out clearly, the doctrine of nass could also work in favour of others who claimed it. It seems that such a claim of nass may have been put forward on behalf of Ibn al-Hanafiya by the various groups mentioned.

Another doctrine that helped partisans to explain the rather ambivalent attitude in public of the various claimants for the Imamate was

the doctrine of taqIya (precautionary dissimulation). Thus Imams could pledge allegiance to despotic caliphs under this doctrine without affecting their own claims to the Imamate.

CHAPTER THREE

ASPECTS OF AL-BĀQIR'S LIFE AND CAREER

Al-Bāqir's full name was Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn b.ᶜAli b.Abī Ṭālib while his nickname was Abū Jaᶜfar. His mother was Umm ᶜAbdAllāh, the daughter of al-Ḥasan b. ᶜAlī. Thus al-Bāqir was the first one in the family to have descent from both the Prophet's grandsons.[1] He was born about 57 A.H.[2] in Medina, roughly around the time when Muᶜāwiya was exacting the oath of allegiance from the people for hisson, Yazīd.[3]

When a mere child, his family was afflicted by the tragedy of Karbalā'. There is a report in al-Yaᶜqūbī[4] which says that al-Bāqir was actually present at Karbalā'. This must have left a profound impression on him. His early childhood

---

1. Qādī al-Nuᶜmān Sharḥ f.63; Manāqib f.299a.

2. Most authorities are unanimous about this date. See al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p.469; al-ᶜAmili ᶜAyān al Shīᶜa IV p.3. Although some authorities like to maintain it was the year 56 AH.

3. Al-Ṭabarī Annales I ed. De Goeje, 2nd series (Netherlands, 1964) p.173.

4. al-Yaᶜqūbī II, p.320 says that al-Bāqir was not only present there but that he even remembers his grandfather being killed.

and teens witnessed the struggle for powers involving the Umayyads, Ibn al-Zubayr and groups of Shī^{c}ites while at the same time he saw his father remaining aloof and avoiding getting entangled in the politics of the day.

1) <u>The Laqab al-Bāqir</u>:

It is difficult to determine when al-Bāqir acquired this epithet which is a shortened form of <u>Bāqir al-^{c}Ilm</u> "One who splits open knowledge." It is also equally difficult to say whether he was known as such in his very lifetime or whether he later came to be known as such. The earliest evidence we have of a writer calling him as such is a third century writer, Zubayr b. Bakkār (d.c. 256A.H./870A.D.). Both al-Qādī al-Nu^{c}mān[1] and Ibn Ḥajar[2] mention Zubayr b. Bakkār as saying that Muḥammad b. ^{c}Alī was called <u>Bāqir al ^{c}Ilm</u>.

According to Ibn Ḵallikān[3], Muḥammad b. ^{c}Alī

---

1. <u>Sharḥ -al-Akhbār</u> f. 68. In his other manuscript <u>al- Manāqib</u> f.299a, al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān does mention that he was called <u>Bāqir al-^{c}Ilm</u> but without mentioning the source of Zubayr b. Bakkār.

2. Ibn Hajar al-Asqalānī <u>Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb</u> says that according to Zubayr b. Bakkār, Muḥammad b. ^{c}Alī was called <u>Bāqir al-^{c}Ilm</u>. See his vol.9-10 pp. 350 ff.

3. <u>Wafāyāt</u> (trans. de Slane) Vol.II, p.579.

received the epithet al-Bāqir because he collected an ample fund of knowledge but he does not specify when he received this appellation and from whom. Ya^{c}qūbī[1] says that he used to be called Bāqir al-^{c}Ilm because he split open knowledge. The Lisān al-^{c}Arab[2] says that Muḥammad b. ^{c}Alī b. al-Ḥusayn b. Alī al-Bāqir was called thus because he split open knowledge, knew its principles (or roots), discovered its branches and had vast knowledge.

For the Shī^{c}a in general, the title Bāqir al-^{c}Ilm was no ordinary title for it was in their view, given to him by the Prophet. According to the account given in al-Kulaynī[3], Jābir b. ^{c}AbdAllāh the oldest surviving companion of the Prophet, used to sit in the mosque of the Prophet wearing a black turban and call out :"Ya Bāqir al-^{c}Ilm", "Ya Bāqir al-^{c}Ilm" i.e. "Oh, One who splits open knowledge." People in Medina used to say Jābir was talking nonsense but he told them that the reason why he was talking

---

1. Ya^{c}qūbī Ta'rīkh II, p.320.
2. Ibn Manzūr, p.140

   والتبقر التوسع في العلم والمال وكان يقال لمحمد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي الباقر رضوان الله عليهم لانه بقر العلم وبزغ اصله واستنبط فرعه وتبقر في العلم .
3. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I, p.469.

like that was because he had actually heard the Prophet say:

> "O! Jābir, You will meet a man from my family who will have the same name and the same characteristics as mine, and who will split open knowledge extensively."[1]

As regards how Jābir met al-Bāqir, the report in al-Kulaynī[2] recounts that once it so happened that Jābir was going to and fro in some of the streets of Medina when he passed by a street that had a Qur'ān school (kuttāb) which al-Bāqir used to attend. When Jābir saw him, he asked him to go near him to which al-Bāqir responded. When Jābir asked him to return al-Bāqir did that as well. Thereupon Jābir explained:

> "Characteristics of the Messenger of Allah; by Him in whose Hands is my soul, O boy, what is your name?"

When al-Bāqir told him that he was Muhammad b. ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn, Jābir went up to him and kissed his head and swore by his father and mother that the Messenger of Allah had recited his greetings upon him.

Another account of this episode is given

---

1. al-Kulaynī l-Kāfī I, p.469.
2. al-Kāfī I, pp.460-470.

by al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān[1] according to whom Jābir b. ᶜAbdAllāh used to inquire about al-Ḥusayn's grandson as to whether there was anyone among them by the name of Muḥammad. One day, he happened to pass by the house of ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn and heard the maid-servant calling someone, 'Muḥammad'. This was when he had already lost his sight. So he asked his guide whether that was the house of ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn and when he was told that it was, he asked the maid-servant who this Muḥammad was whom she was calling. She said it was Muḥammed b. ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn whereupon Jābir asked her to bring the child near him. When she did so Jābir kept on rubbing his face over him, kissing his hands and feet and said : "O! Son of the Messenger of Allāh, your grandfather has recited his greetings to you."

---

1. Manāqib, f. 299b - 300a. The account given by al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān in his Sharh is different. Here it is al-Bāqir who happens to go and visit Jabir who had already lost his sight by then. When asked who he was, al-Bāqir said that he was Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn whereupon Jābir asked him to go near him. He then began kissing his hand and when he bent to kiss his feet, al-Bāqir moved away. It was then that Jābir told him that the Messenger of Allāh had recited his greetings upon him. So al-Bāqir asked Jābir as to how that had happened and Jābir related that once it so happened that the Prophet told him that he would meet Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn from amongst his sons whom God will grant light and wisdom. The Prophet then asked him to recite his greetings to this son.

When Jābir was asked regarding this matter he said that once al-Ḥusayn happened to be playing before the Messenger of Allāh when he said:

> "O! Jābir. You will live until you meet the son of this boy who will be called Muḥammad al-Bāqir, whom God will give 'The Light' and 'The Wisdom'. So recite upon him my greetings."[1]

The incident given in al-Ṭabarī[2] produces still another angle to the meeting whereby Jābir went up to al-Bāqir when he was in the Qur'ān school, (kuttāb). Jābir asked him to uncover his belly and when al-Bāqir did that, Jābir kissed it and said that the Messenger of Allāh had asked him to recite his greetings upon him.

There are many difficulties regarding this episode, not least the existence of variants. The material so far examined shows a divergence of views not only about the title itself but also regarding how and when Jābir met al-Bāqir. For, according to al-Kulaynī[3] the Prophet is supposed to have said to Jābir that he would meet a man from his family who would have the same name and

---

1. Manāqib op.cit.
2. al-Ta'rikh III p.2496 وحدثني محمد بن عبد الله الحضرمي قال
سآ سويد ابن سعيد قال نآ مفضل بن عبد الله من أبان بن تغلب من ابي جعفر
قال جاءني جابر بن عبد الله وانا في الكتاب فقال لي اكشف من بطنك فكشفت
له من بطني فقبله ثم قال ان رسول الله صلعم امرني ان اقرئك السلام .
3. al-Kafī I, pp.469-70.

and same characteristics as he and who would split open knowledge extensively. Whereas al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān[1] maintains, Jābir was told about meeting a son of Ḥusayn who apparently had been playing before the Messenger of Allah, who would be called Muḥammad al-Bāqir whom God would grant 'light' and 'wisdom'. Al-Ṭabarī's[2] account does not say anything of the title but that Jābir asked al-Bāqir to uncover his belly and when he did so, he kissed it saying that the Messenger had recited his greetings to him.

This last aspect of reciting greetings is maintained by all the three versions. There seems to be a general agreement among the early sources that the two had certainly met. There also seems to be strong indication from widely differing sources (al-Ṭabarī, al Kulaynī and al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān) that Jābir had regarded this great, great-grandson of the Prophet as someone special in religious terms.

With regard to the question of whether al-Bāqir was called as such during his very lifetime, there is an interesting report preserved by Ibn ᶜInaba in his Umdat

---

1. Manāqib f.299b-300a.

2. Tārīkh p.2496. This report is apparently from al-Bāqir himself which certainly looks abbreviated if not subdued.

al-Tālib[1]:-

وفد أخوه زيد بن علي على هشام
بن عبد الملك فقال له هشام ما فعل
اخوك البقرة ؟ يعني الباقر فقال
زيد لقد ما خالفت رسول الله س سماه
الباقر وسميته انت البقره لتخالفنه
بسم القيامه ، يدخل هو الجنة
وتدخل انت النار :

When Zayd b. ᶜAlī called on to see Hishām b. ᶜAbd al-Malik, he asked Zayd how was his brother, the cow, (al-Baqara) implying al-Bāqir. So Zayd told him that he had vehemently opposed the Messenger of Allah who had named him al-Bāqir while he was calling him al-Baqara. Zayd then went on to tell Hisham that the Messenger would surely oppose him on the day of resurrection when the former would enter Heaven while he (Hisham) would go to hell.

The above report, if authentic, is quite significant for, it not only means that al-Bāqir was called as such during his life-time but it also suggests that the Prophet had already been associated with giving him that name. The fact that Caliph Hisham

---

1. Al-Sayyid Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ᶜAlī al-Ḥasanī popularly known as Ibn ᶜInaba (d. 828 A.H.) ᶜUmdat al-Ṭālib, 2nd edition (Najaf, 1961) p.194.

distorted the title of al-Bāqir to al-Baqara suggests that al-Bāqir was indeed known as such during his lifetime. Moreover, the fact that Zayd, who was otherwise in opposition to his brother,. defended his title as having been given to him by the Prophet, also makes it conceivable that as early as the beginning of the second century al-Bāqir was known as such which means in his life-time.

However, whether the traditions about the title are true or not, the concept appears certainly true in the light of the traditions that have come down from al-Bāqir in the various Shīᶜite works of all persuasions, Zaydī, Ithnā ᶜAsharī and Ismāᶜīlī.[1] Moreover, sporadic traditions from him are also found in major Sunnite works such as Mālik's Muwaṭṭā', Ibn Hanbal's Musnad and al-'Shafīᶜīᶜ Risāla.[2] Al-Ṭabarī not only uses him as an authority in his famous Ta'rīkh but in his voluminous Tafsīr, al-Bāqir's traditions have been included.

Thus, from the various works, both, Shīᶜite and non -Shīᶜite al-Bāqir emerges as a versatile scholar

---

1. See chapter on Al-Bāqir's contribution to Fiqh.
2. For details see the chapter on 'al-Bāqir in traditionist circles'.

conversant not only in matters of rites and rituals but also on the exegesis of the Qur'ān,questions pertaining to law as such as well as theological topics of both mundane mundane and spiritual nature. It is also significant to note that before al-Bāqir's time, Shīᶜite learning was limited. Then suddenly in his time there was a sudden profusion of knowledge on various aspects. He thus happened to be the first Imam of the Shīᶜa from whom such a vast corpus of ḥadīth literature has come down.[1]

Thus whether the tradition is true or not and whether the title is subject to prophecy or not, the title itself has meaning, the significance of which is much more a matter for scholarship. It emphasizes the role al-Bāqir played in disseminating knowledge to the general public as well as his place in Shīᶜite literature.

2. <u>Waṣīya</u>:

According to both Ithnaᶜ Asharī and Ismaᶜīlī

---

1. What has been preserved from his son and successor is even more.

sources[1] after Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn's death in c.94 A.H. his son, al-Bāqir succeeded to the Imāmāte as a spiritual function. The traditions in al-Kulaynī would tend to suggest that al-Bāqir actually received a chest full of weapons and books of the Messenger of Allah from his father in the presence of his brothers.[2]

It is believed that the weapons which symbolize authority consisted of the sword, the armour, the helmet as well as the short spear (ᶜanazah) of the Prophet. Besides these weapons, traditions in al-Kulaynī maintain that the Imams also inherited certain documents that contained important information. In fact the jāmiᶜa is supposed to contain everything that man may need; every case of law was covered by it, even bloodwit for a scratch. Other documents that the Imams are supposed to have possessed are the jafr a leather bag containing knowledge and the maṣḥaf of Fāṭima. This maṣḥaf, it is believed, contained messages that Fāṭima

---

1. al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī I, 305-6; al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān, Sharḥ al-Akhbār p.62 ff and Manāqib p.299 ff does not specifically say in these two works that the Imam after Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn was al-Bāqir, nor does he give the various traditions given in al-Kulaynī. However, the way he has dealt with the Imams one after the other, it is obvious that he means al-Bāqir succeeded his father, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn. Cf. his Daᶜā'im I, p.43 where he mentions the Imams one after the other by their names.

2. al-Kāfī I, pp.305-6; See also Majlisī Biḥār VI, pp.100ff and Mufīd Irshād (trans. Howard), p.393.

received from an angel after the Prophet's death.[1]

It appears that the jāmiᶜa did certainly exist. However, it is an open question whether or not this document as well as the sword of the Prophet[2] were in possession of al-Ḥusayn's descendants.

3. Rivals of al-Bāqir

When al-Bāqir took over from his father, the Kaysānīya in its various branches was a prominent group. Of all the branches, the Hāshimīya, a group that had pronounced itself in favour of Abū Hāshim, the son of Ibn al-Ḥanafiya appeared more active. Sources[3] suggest that their leader Abū Hāshim certainly vied for the Imamate according to a record of a meeting between him and al-Bāqir. It so happened that once al-Bāqir was

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī, pp. 232-241.

2. According to some sources, the sword appears to have belonged to the Ḥasinad branch of the Prophet's family. See al-Isfahānī Maqātil (Najaf 1303 A.H.) p. 188.

3. al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Manāqib f.302. Also see his Sharḥ, f.70. Idrīs ᶜImād al-Dīn who wrote his ᶜUyūn al-Akhbār much later also mentions this meeting.

sitting in the mosque talking to people around him, when suddenly Abū Hāshim came up to him, abusing him:

> "You (plural) claim the <u>waṣīya</u> of the Messenger of Allāh by deception and lies."

Al-Bāqir replied:

> "Say what you like. I am the son of Fāṭima, while you are from a Ḥanafite woman."

When the people in the audience heard this, they pounced upon Abū Hāshim and began pelting him with stones and sandals until he was driven out of the mosque. There may or may not be some exaggeration in the details of the above incident but there seems to be hardly any doubt that he did aspire for the leadership. This is also evident from the fact that he was not only living in exile,[1] but also because he was poisoned by Caliph Sulaymān before whom he had made his claims public. Abu Hāshim's death in c. 98./817-8 led to new splits. Sources[2] indicate no less than four to five groups claiming succession from him although he himself had died childless.

---

1. Ei^2 <u>art</u>. "Abū Hāshim".

2. Nawbakhtī <u>Firaq</u> p. 28 says that the Hāshimīya split into four groups but ᶜAbd al-Jabbār (d.415) in his <u>al-Mughnī</u> Vol. 20 part II (Dār al-Misrīya n.d.) pp.177ff quoting Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī (d.270) says there were five.

One group asserted that Abū Hāshim was the mahdī and he was alive hiding in the mountains of Raḍwā. Another group claimed that he had appointed his brother ᶜAlī and that the Imamate was then continued through ᶜAlī's son al-Ḥasan and so on, maintaining that it belonged exclusively to the descendents of Muḥammad al-Ḥanafiya. They also believed that the Imamate could not be transferred to others, and that the mahdī will come from their house.[1]

Others believed that Abū Hāshim died and appointed ᶜAbdAllāh b. Muᶜāwiya b. ᶜAbdAllah b. Jaᶜfar b. Abī Ṭālib[2] then a child after him, in charge of a certain Sāliḥ b. Mudrik (acting as a temporary Imam): the latter then handed over the authority to his charge when the child became of age. He became the ruler of Isfāhān but was later imprisoned by Abū Muslim and eventually executed.[3]

---

1. Ivanow, "Early Shīᶜite Movements", JBBRAS (1941) 17, p.6.

2. He rose in Kūfa in Muharram of 127/744 and was defeated. However, he was able to withdraw to Persia. See art. on him EI, vol. I, pp.26-27; Ṭabari, Vol.II, pp.1879-87, 1947-8, 1976-80. Cf. Also Ibn ᶜInaba's (d.825/1422)ᶜUmdat al-Ṭālib, pp.21-22. He was ultimately overpowered by Abu Muslim, imprisoned in Herat in 129-746-7 and was either executed or, as the author of ᶜUmdat al-Ṭālib says, was kept in prison till 183/799 when he died. Nawbakhti, op.cit. pp.29ff. says his followers split into several groups after his death.

3. Ivanow, "Early Shīᶜite Movements," p.6; Nawbakhti, op. cit. p.29.

Yet another group maintained that he died without having appointed anyone to succeed him; they believed in their headmen being their Imams.[1] Many however believed that Abū Hashīm had appointed Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī b. ᶜAbdAllāh b. ᶜAbbās as the Imam after Abū Hāshim, asserting that before his death Abū Hāshim had handed the appointment to his father ᶜAlī b. ᶜAbdAllāh in trust for him since Muḥammad was still a minor.[2] It is reported that this group who believed in Muhammad b. ᶜAlī and the group which followed ᶜAbdAllāh b. Muᶜāwiya disputed and then agreed to have an arbitration by one of their chiefs, Abū Riyāḥ. He decided the case in favour of Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī whereupon ᶜAbdAllāh b. Muᶜāwiya's party is believed to have joined Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī's group and together they were known as the Riyāhīyya.[3]

Those who trace the Imāmate through the ᶜAbbāsid Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī and his son Ibrāhīm to the ᶜAbbāsid

---

1. Ivanow, "Early Shīᶜite Movements", p.6 wonders if this has anything to do with the Qarmatians of Bahrayn.

2. Nawbakhtī, op.cit. p.29; Ivanhow, op.cit. p.6; Madelung's art. in EI², p.837. See also art. "ᶜAlī b. ᶜAbdAllāh b. ᶜAbbās" EI².

3. Madelung, op.cit. Nawbakhtī mentions the merger of the two groups but does not say that they were known as Riyahiya; It is interesting to note that Abu al-ᶜAbbās al-Ṣaffāh and Abū Jaᶜfar al-Manṣūr were present in ᶜAbdAllāh's army.

caliphs commonly came to be known as Rawāndīya[1] although some heresiographers restrict the name to those who claimed that the first Imam after the death of the Prophet was his uncle, al-ᶜAbbās and that the Imamate continued among his descendants.[2] Al-Nāshī'[3] also mentions sects of Bukayrīya[4] and Khidāshīya within the early ᶜAbbasid movement. The former were the followers of Bukayr b. Mahān (d. 127/744-5), the Kūfan dāᶜī mainly responsible for the organization of the ᶜAbbāsid movement in Khurāsān. The Khidāshīya were called after ᶜAmmār b. Yazīd, nicknamed Khidāsh, a dāᶜī active in the area of Nisapur and Merv. When Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī disowned him on account of doctrinal deviation, his supporters held that Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī had forfeited the Imāmate and that it had passed to Khidāsh. Khidāsh was executed in 118/736 but his supporters maintained that he was alive and had been raised to heaven by God.[5]

---

1. Baghdādī, Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq , p.28; see also Madelung op.cit. For some details on the Rawāndīya, see F. Omar, The ᶜAbbāsid Caliphate, (Baghdad, 1969), pp.192-9.

2. Madelung, op.cit.

3. Al-Nāshī, Masā'il al-Imāma, ed.Jan van Ess,(Beirut, (Beirut, 1971), pp.24-41.

4. Baghdādī, op.cit., p.28; Nawbakhtī, op.cit. p.30f; Madelung, op.cit.; also art. 'Bayān b. Samᶜān' in EI² by M.G.S. Hodgson; see also Watt, Formative Period, pp.50-51.

5. Al-Nāshī', op.cit.

The fact that there were so many splinter groups within the Shīᶜite movement obviously meant that for most of the early Shīᶜite sympathizers it did not matter who was the leader, provided he was an Ḥāshīmid. As pointed out earlier, the doctrine of nass was being used to work in favour of anyone who claimed it. Until now, the various claimants were restricted to the ᶜAlīds only, but the claim that Abū Hāshim passed his heritage to the Abbāsids as well as the assertions of Bayān and Abū Mansūr claiming nass shows that the doctrine of nass was being used and could be used to extend the hereditary field of the Imamate. This is where al-Bāqir must have perhaps felt the need to lay out the theory of the Imamate with its various requirements.[1]

Al-Bāqir did have a special advantage however, in that he was no ordinary ᶜAlīd for, as pointed out, both his paternal and maternal grandfathers were the Prophet's grandsons who were therefore, in some sense, sacred.[2] This descent from Fāṭima that eventually came to be a major force of appeal among both, the Ismāᶜīlīs

---

1. This is discussed in the following chapter "Al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate."

2. In Abū Mikhnaf's narratives on Karbalā' there is already the sense that al-Husayn being the grandson of the Prophet was in some sense sacred. Al-Ṭabarī Ta'rīkh.

and the Ithnā ᶜAsharīs, gave al-Bāqir a unique lineage and secured him a sound position among some circles at least.

Al-Bāqir did manage to rally around himself a number of followers[1] in spite of the various claimants that existed and in addition to the followers acquired during his father's time, especially during the latter years of his life. According to al-Balkhī[2] even ᶜAlī b. al-Husayn did have a following of his own, let alone al-Bāqir, whose times were more conducive for public teaching than his father's. Thus, there is little doubt that al-Bāqir was recognised as an Imam during his life-time and views expressed by some scholars[3] are no longer acceptable. The stories in Nawbakhtī[4] of al-Bāqir's difficulties with some of his followers are too life-like to be easily dismissed. The anecdote about a group that followed ᶜUmar b. Riyāḥ in abandoning al-Bāqir[5], although being rather damaging

---

1. See the section on Shīᶜite associates of al-Bāqir included in the chapter, "Al-Bāqir in traditionist circles."

2. ᶜAbd al-Jabbār, al-Mughnī p. 177.

3. Watt, Formative Period, p. 52. See also his art. "Shīᶜism under the Umayyads (JRAS, 1960) pp. 168-9.

4. Firaq, pp. 52-3; 54-5.

5. After he gave two different answers to the same question. See Nawbakhtī, pp. 52-55.

in itself has a positive side in that it proves that al-Bāqir did indeed have a following of his own and that some among them were given to repudiate him as well.[1]

Moreover the fact that Bayān and Abū Manṣūr both claimed at some point to be al-Bāqir's <u>waṣi</u>[2] shows that al-Bāqir must have been of sufficient importance as an Imam for these men to claim the <u>waṣīya</u> from him. Some followers of al-Bāqir's like al-Mughīra b. Sa^{c}īd al-Ijlī, went as far as claiming that al-Bāqir was Divine; and although al-Mughīra was repudiated by him, this, together with other instances mentioned above are strong evidences to prove that al-Bāqir was indeed recognized as an Imam if only within his own circle.

Furthermore, even though the ideas of the Kaysānīya found poetic expression in poets like Kuthayyir and Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī, al-Bāqir too, did not lack poets who carried his family's name far and wide. During his father's time, the poet Farazdaq used to compose many verses. Once during a pilgrimage when Hishām b. ^{c}Abd al-Malik (who was then a prince) was unable to touch

---

1. Another follower of al-Bāqir, Muḥammad b.Qays also left him after what be heard from Ibn Riyāḥ's views.

2. To be discussed in the section below on <u>Ghulāt</u>.

the blackstone because of the crowd, and saw people giving way to Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn, he asked angrily who that person was. In reply, Farazdaq recited an ode[1] in Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn's favour.

Even more popular than Farazdaq were the verses of Kumayt (d.126A.H.) who was a contemporary of al-Bāqir[2]. His verses, the Hāshimīyāt were such that they could be appreciated by a larger public unlike those of Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī who offended people by vilifying the first two caliphs.[3] Kumayt did not go beyond the limit of 'tashayuᶜḥasan' and although at times he expresssed some fear of the Umayyads,[4] in his heart their power was an illegitimate one.[5]

Kumayt publicly declared that the claims of the Banu Hashim were based on the fact that they were the inheritors[6] and that these claims found their support in the Qur'an.[7] It must be mentioned however that the

---

1. See Farazdaq, Diwān I, pp.847 ff; Aghānī XX I, pp.400 ff. J. Hell however denies the attribution of these verses to Farazdaq apud Arendonk p.15.

2. See pp.23 and 139 of Kumayt's Hāshimīyāt in the Horovitz edition.

3. Aghānī, vol. 7, p.41, lines 15-17.

4. Kumayt Hāshimīyāt 4, vv, 86ff and 102ff.

5. ibid 2 vv. 28, 31, 37 ff.

6. Kumayt Hāshimīyāt 2 vv. 38 ff.

7. ibid 2 vv 29 ff.

verses which Kumayt cited such as "I do not ask you for retribution, only love for my next of kin,"[1] were being equally used by the Abbāsids and later by the Zaydīya as well. This is due to the difference in interpretation of the words "next of kin," which were being used to include the whole family of the Prophet.

Al-Bāqir and the Ghulāt

Al-Bāqir also faced problems from some individuals who became classed among the ghulāt (exaggerators). One such person was the already mentioned Bayān b. Sim^{c}ān.[2] At first he believed that Abū Hāshim would return as the mahdī. He and his followers, the Bayānīya adopted extremist views about Abū Hāshim and claimed that he had conferred prophethood on Bayān on behalf of God.[3] According to another report[4], Bayān later wrote to

---

1. Qur'an 22 : 42.

2. See Tucker, William F. "Bayān b. Sim^{c}ān and the the Bayānīya: Shī^{c}ite extremists of Umayyād Iraq" Muslim World 65/4 (1985) pp.241-53.

3. Madelung art. "Kaysāniyya" EI^{2}.

4. Nawbakhtī Firaq 30,25; cf. Baghdādī pp.227ff; Shahrastani Milal pp. 113ff. See also Hodgson, art "Bayān b. Sam^{c}ān" EI^{2}. Watt, Formative Period p.51, thinks this might be a later invention to support the Shī^{c}ite claims that al-Bāqir was recognized as Imam during his lifetime. Refer also al-Rāzī k, al-Zīna p.297 in al-Sāmarrā'ī's edition.

Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī (al-Bāqir) perhaps after Abū Hāshim's death and called on him to accept himself (i.e. Bayān) as a prophet. Probably after al-Bāqir's death he is believed to have claimed that al-Bāqir had appointed him as his emissary. However, there are also reports to say that he was hostile to al-Bāqir. Other reports maintain that he was planning a revolt[1] either in the name of al-Bāqir's son, Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq or of al-Nafs al-Zakīya, a Ḥasanid who actually revolted in 762 A.D. Bayān himself together with al-Mughīra was executed in Kūfa by the order of the governor Khālid al-Qasrī.[2]

Among other ghulāt, there was a group called Harbīya or Ḥārithīya, after their leader ᶜAbdAllāh b. al-Ḥarb.[3] Sources ascribe to them a prominent role in the introduction of the theory of metempsychosis (mask) and other extremist ideas. After the death of Abū Hāshim, Ibn Ḥarb taught that the Divine Spirit (rūh Allāh) had been present in Prophet Muḥammad and had

---

1. In conjunction it is believed with his associate al-Mughīra b.Saᶜīd al-Ijlī.

2. al-Ṭabarī II 1619 ff.

3. His name is variously given as ᶜAbdAllah (b. ᶜAmr) b. (al-) Ḥārith al-Kindī al-Kufī or al-Madā'inī or al-Shamī. See Madelung's art. in EI^2 where he says this may indicate a fusion of more than one person into a single identity. See also Ashᶜarī i, 6,22; Baghdādī 233f; 235f; Shahrastānī 1 244f. Ibn Ḥazm iv 187f has ᶜAbdAllah b. al Ḥarith who may be the same, Cf JAOS XXIX 124 ff. See also Halm in Der Islam 58 (1981)

successively been transferred to ᶜAlī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn Ibn al-Ḥanafīyya, Abū Hāshim and finally to Ibn Ḥarb who thus had become the Iman until the reappearance of Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya. However, when his claim of omniscience was found to be spurious by his followers, many of them renounced him in favour of ᶜAbdAllāh b. Muᶜāwiya.[1] It is suggested that Ibn Ḥarb was converted to Sufrī Khārijism[2] and died as a Sufrite.[3]

Another individual regularly classed among the ghulāt who caused problems for al-Bāqir was al-Mughīra b. Saᶜīd al-Ijlī[4] who was mentioned earlier on. He was a client of the governor, Khālid b. ᶜAbdAllāh al-Qasrī and used to claim that al-Bāqir had appointed him as the waṣī. Later perhaps after al-Bāqir's death he claimed that he was an agent of Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllāh

---

1. It is doubtful whether he himself approved of the claims made for him; some were not made until after his death in c.747 A.D. when he was assassinated by Abū Muslin. See Watt, "Shīᶜism under the Umayyads" JRAS 1920.

2. For details on this type of Khārijism, see Watt, Formative period pp.26f.

3. Madelung's art. in EI^2.

4. al-Rāzī, K. al-Zīna pp.302ff as well as Qāḍī al-Nuᶜman's Daᶜa'im p.49. See also Ashᶜarī pp.6-9 and Nawbakhtī, pp.52-55. Also refer to Tucker's art. "Rebels and Gnostics: al-Mughira Ibn Saᶜīd and the Mughīrīya." Arabica 22/1 (1975) pp.33-47.

b. al-Ḥasan (al-Nafs al-Zakīya).[1] He claimed the prophethood and Imamate for himself and said that the angel Jibrāʿīl brought him revelations and that he could raise the dead. Khālid b. ʿAbdAllāh had him arrested, killed and crucified.

Yet another person who professed himself as wasī of al-Bāqir was Abū Manṣūr. He either belonged to the tribe of Ijl or ʿAbd al-Qays and lived in Kūfa.[2] Abū Manṣūr further claimed that he had experienced an ascension to heaven, in the course of which he had been appointed by God as a prophet and messenger. He too, like his tribesman, al-Mughīra was executed by the governor of Iraq in 742 A.D.

Still another individual, classed among the ghulāt, adopting extremist views about al-Bāqir was Muʿammar.[3] He claimed that al-Bāqir and Abū al-Khattāb were both gods. They, he maintained, were gods in the heaven while he, Muʿamar was god on earth and that he knew the merit of the heavenly god. He also, used to claim the

---

1. Of whom more will be said in the following pages.

2. Ashʿarī, pp.9ff; Nawbakhtī, p.34 and Baghdādī, pp. 234 ff. See also Tucker's article on "Abū Manṣūr al-Ijlī and the Manṣūrīya, a study in medieval terrorism," Der Islam, 54/1 (1977) pp.66-76.

3. See al-Rāzī K. al-Zīna p.306. According to al-Ashʿarī Maqalāt p. 11 he belonged into later times i.e. during Imam al-Ṣādiq's period.

divinity of Abū Ṭālib, ᶜAbd al-Muṭṭalib, Muḥammad and ᶜAlī.

Al-Bāqir and al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna

As is known, the Alids among themselves were far from united and between the Ḥasanids and the Ḥusaynids there was downright rivalry. This manifested itself at times in family disputes and at other times in the struggle for leadership. During Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn's time al-Ḥasan b. al-Ḥasan known as al-Muthanna - the redoubled happened to be in charge of the ṣadaqāt from estates left by the Prophet. It is believed that Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn contested this office from him which provoked the latter's fury and resulted in him being rude to Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn.[1] There is no apparent evidence that al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna had any designs on the Imamate,[2] although he might have considered his elder lineage to be more entitled to ᶜAlī's spiritual heritage.

After Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn's death, al-Bāqir resumed the quarrel over the ṣadaqāt with al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna and after the latter's death with his son, Zayd b. al-

---

1. al-Mufīd op.cit. p.

2. Yet the fact that his son ᶜAbdAllāh b. al-Ḥasan al Mahḍ was spreading propaganda in favour of his youthful son, Nafs al-Zakīya, raises some doubt as to whether al-Ḥasan's rivalry with Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn only sprang from his fury over the ṣadaqāt.

Ḥasan into whose hands the administration had passed.[1] Yet another son of al-Ḥasan al-Muthannā, ᶜAbdAllāh b. al-Ḥasan al-Mahḍ found himself in opposition to al-Bāqir for different reasons. Although the actual revolt[2] of his son, al-Nafs al-Zakīya took place long after al-Baqir's death, yet the propaganda for him had started much earlier; in fact, as early as his birth in 100/718 he was proclaimed by his father to be the expected mahdī on account of the prophecy that the mahdī had to be called by the same name as the Prophet i.e. Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllāh.[3]

ᶜAbdAllāh al-Mahḍ's effort to spread the propaganda in favour of his youthful son had already met with certain success during the latter years of al-Bāqir's life. The extremist, al-Mughīra b. Saᶜīd, the former supporter of al-Bāqir, changed his allegiance and with a whole circle of his disciples joined ᶜAbdAllah al-Mahḍ and his son[4]. In Madelung's[5] view, this meant

---

1. Kashshī p. 228; Kulaynī al-Kāfī p.189.

2. The revolt took place in 145/762 during the time of Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq when the second ᶜAbbāsid caliph Abū Jaᶜfar al-Manṣūr was reigning (136-158/754-755). See EI art. by F. Buhl vol III pp. 665-6. Also see al-Tabari III pp. 209ff; Ibn Tiqtaqa al-Fakhrī pp. 225 ff.

3. Ivanow "Early Shīᶜite Movements" JBBRAS p. 8-9.

4. Nawbakhtī p. 54; Madelung Der Qāsim p. 46. It is also possible that al-Mughīra probably changed his allegiance after al-Bāqir's death.

5. Ibid.

that the father to son Imāmate was not widely accepted since al-Mughīra could leave al-Bāqir for Nafs al-Zakīya. Even without Mughira's defection there is little doubt that the principle of hereditary Imàmate was not yet established. It was precisely for that reason that al-Bāqir felt it necessary to put forward the views that he did so that some sort of order was brought into the chaos that had resulted from the variant Shī^{c}ite ideas rampant in the Islamic empire.[1]

Al-Bāqir and Zayd

By the turn of the first century Hijra, al-Bāqir was involved in even more serious problems; for according to many Shī^{c}ite sources[2] he had to deal with his own half-brother Zayd b. ^{c}Alī who propagated a more aggressive and revolutionary policy.

It is conceived that the struggle for leadership between al-Bāqir and Zayd began immediately after the death of Zayn al-^{c}Ābidīn[3] while some believe that Zayd had not intended the Imamate for himself and actually

---

1. See below the chapter on 'His views on the Imamate.'

2. See below pp. 87 ff.

3. Jafri, Origins pp. 249, 265; Rajkowski W.W., Early Shi^{c}ism in Iraq (unpublished Ph.D thesis, University of London, 1955) pp.469ff.

favoured his brother's leadership.[1] As far as the first view is concerned, Zayd at the time of his father's death in 94 A.H. was only fourteen years old[2] so it is highly improbable that at that age he would have been able to attract any following. However, in the course of time, Zayd is alleged to have become strongly impressed with the Mu^{c}tazilite ideas of Wāṣil b. Aṭā'.[3] He began laying emphasis on the principles of 'ordering good and prohibiting evil' by force, if necessary and accordingly believed that if an Imam wanted to be recognised, he had to claim his right, sword in hand. Sources[4] suggest that al-Bāqir and Zayd quarrelled over this, for, when the latter asserted that an Imam must rise against the oppressors, al-Bāqir remarked: "So you deny your own father was Imam, for he never fought the issue." If this were true, then considering Zayd's age, this could not have happened earlier than the beginning of second century Hijra.

---

1. al-Mufīd K. al Irshād trans. I. K.A. Howard (London 1981) pp.403-4. Al-Mufīd says Zayd was even aware of the bequest of trusteeship to Ja^{c}far al-Ṣādiq.

2. Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān Manāqib lī Ahl al-Bayt f.305. Idris ^{c}Imād al-Dīn ^{c}Uyūn al Akhbar IV pp.228ff. Ibn Sa^{c}d K. Ṭabaqāt al Kubra V, p.42 al Mufīd op. cit.

3. See H. Nybergs' art. in SEI pp. 421 ff. Ibn al-Murtaḍa al-Mu^{c}tazila p.20.

4. Shahrastānī Milal I P.260. Nashwān al-Himyarī Ḥūr al ^{c}Ayn (Tafsir) p.186 apud Rajkowski op. cit.

Zayd is believed to have rejected the Muᶜtazilite doctrine of "the intermediate state" Manzila bayna al-manzilatayn), although he did not object to the opinion that in the quarrels that raged between ᶜAlī and his opponents, one party was certainly wrong.[1] The Muᶜtazilites were not sure which but, for Zayd, the virtues of ᶜAlī were of such superior quality that the idea of him being in the wrong was incomprehensible.[2] However, he agreed with the Muᶜtazilites[3] that although ᶜAlī was the best (al-afḍal) and therefore the preferrable candidate, yet, Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar had been legally elected leaders. This attitude of his greatly impressed the circle of traditionists and was a major factor in securing him their sympathy and support.[4]

As far as Mufid's[5] views about Zayd's revolt are

---

1. Nawbakhtī Firaq p.12; Shahrastānī Milal, I, p.160.

2. Jāḥiẓ, Majmuᶜa al Rasā'il, p.178.

3. At this stage, however, it is difficult to identify the actual doctrines of the early Muᶜtazila and many of their doctrines about ᶜAlī may well belong to a later stage in the development.

4. Some however, also took him up on his views, as for instance the two Kūfan Shīᶜite brothers, Abū Bakr b. Muḥammad al-Ḥaḍramī and ᶜAlqama who asked him whether ᶜAlī was an Imām before he resorted to the sword. Zayd is believed to have refused to answer See Kashshī Ikhtiyār Maᶜrifat al-Rijāl p. 416. Also see Ibn Nashwān al Ḥimyarī Hurr al ᶜAyn (Cairo 1948) p. 185

5. K. al-Irshād op.cit.

concerned, i.e. that his main reason was seeking vengeance for Ḥusayn's blood and that he really did not intend the leadership for himself, these are no longer tenable in view of the facts revealed in other sources much earlier than his.[1]

All the early writers such as al-Ṭabarī, Ibn Sa^{c}d, al-Isfahānī and also Ismā^{c}īlī authors like Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī and al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān give the reason for Zayd's revolt to be the order for his arrest by Caliph Hishām. This arrest was on account of some money being lent to Zayd by the deposed governor Khālid b. ^{c}AbdAllah al-Qasrī. It is clear that this was undoubtedly the apparent and the immediate cause of his revolt. But one does not have to look very far to realise that this could hardly have been the main reason for his rebellion.

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān **Manāqib** f. 303 ff; **Sharḥ** f. 69 ff. Also see **K. al Zīna** of Abū Hātim al-Rāzī who is even earlier than the Qāḍī and who is a source for the Qāḍī in his words. The text of **K. al-Zīna** is published in al-Sāmarrā'īs work **al-Ghulāt** (Iraq, 1972) in the appendix.

According to al-Yaᶜqūbī, Hishām told Zayd that he had heard that he considered himself worthy of the Caliphate.[1] When taunted as to how the black-skinned son of a slave-woman could be a caliph, his ready reply was that the Prophet himself had descended from Ishmael who was also the son of a slave.[2] It is quite likely that Hishām having been informed about Zayd's motives and plans may have made the money business a pretext to find out more about them and later not having substantial evidence against him had to release him when he and Dāwūd b. ᶜAlī (b. ᶜAbdAllāh b. ᶜAbbās) swore that they did not have the money.

---

1. Yaᶜqūbī Ta'rīkh II, p.325.

2. al-Ṭabarī, Annales ed. M.J. de Geoje Secunda Series II (Netherlands, 1964) p. 1676. See also Yaᶜqubi op. cit. Al-Mufid op. cit. pp.403-5 also gives this episode but with a slight variation. In his version Zayd visited Hishām when the latter said to him: "So it is you who considers yourself entitled to the Caliphate." Then Hishām taunted Zayd about him having no mother for his mother was only a servant-girl.

Those who supported Zayd b. ᶜAli's rebellion against the Umayyad caliph Hishām b. ᶜAbd al-Malik were later all known as the Zaydīya.[1] Among the groups who supported Zayd in his rebellion were some Baṭrīya (Buṭrīya) and Jārūdiya.

Baṭrīya:

At the time, one of the differences among the various groups was the legitimacy of Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar's leadership. Depending on this view was the belief whether the early community had erred or not in

---

1. Masᶜūdī Murūj al-Dhahab Vol. 3-4 (Beirut new edition) pp. 208 ff. classifies the Zaydiya into eight groups while Baghdādī Farq speaks of only three - the Jārūdīya, the Baṭrīya and the Sulaymānīya. Ibn Hazm, Kitāb al-Milal wa al-Niḥal, part of which Friedlaender has translated in his article in the JAOS vol. 28, 29 considers the Zaydīya within the Shīᶜa and only talks of the Jārūdīya. See also Nawbakhtī who divides the Zaydīya initially into 'weak' and 'strong' and then goes on to subdivide them pp. 50 ff. al-Rāzī, K. al-Zīna classifies them into Jārūdīya (or Surhubīya), ᶜIjlīya and Batrīya. See pp. 300-302.

having chosen them. This obviously was based on the idea whether or not the Prophet had nominated his successor. Following the traditions of the moderate wing of the Kūfan Shīᶜa, the Baṭrīya[1] upheld the leadership of Abū Bakr, ᶜUmar and of ᶜUthmān during the first six years of his rule. Their basis for this belief was that ᶜAlī had pledged allegiance to them. They repudiated ᶜUthmān during the last six years of his rule, just as they repudiated all later opponents of ᶜAlī.[2]

Considering ᶜAlī the most excellent (afḍal) of men,

---

1. Shahrastānī speaks of Sālihīya, the followers of al-Ḥasan b. Sālih b. Ḥayy and Baṭrīya as the followers of Kathir al-Abtār, while Baghdādī mentions them jointly as Baṭrīya and distinguishes the Sulaymānīya or the Jarīrīya as those who only differed from the Baṭrīya with regard to ᶜUthmān's position whom they considered unorthodox.

2. Madelung's art. on "Imama" in EI², p. 1166; cf. Nawbakti, pp. 12, 50 who just says that they repudiate ᶜUthmān, Ṭalha and Zubayr without specifying the last six years. Baghdādī says that the Baṭrīya did not commit themselves regarding ᶜUthmān, neither attacking his faults nor praising his virtues. See n.3 before.

the Batrīya allowed the imamate of the less excellent (mafḍūl). They regarded the rebellion (khurūj) of anyone among the children of ᶜAli as though it were 'ordering the good and forbidding the evil' (al-amr bi-al-maᶜrūf wa al-nahī ᶜan al-Munkar).[1] They did not observe al-masḥ ᶜalā al-khuffayn, i.e. the wiping of shoes in ritual ablution but drinking nabīdh (intoxicting date-wine) and eating of eels (jirrī) were permissible.[2] They also maintained that 'knowledge' was not only confined to the Prophet's family but was also scattered among the ordinary people and thus the seeker of knowledge was entitled to receive it from either of them. Again if the seeker was unable to find it in either of them, then Nawbakhtī[3] says, it was permissible for them to practice ijtihād and ikhtiyār (choice) as well as advocate individual opinions (ara').

---

1. Nawbakhtī, p.51. He classifies the ᶜIjlīya, followers of Ḥārun b. Saᶜīd al-Ijlī with the Batrīya as the 'weak' Zaydīya.

2. Nawbakhtī, p.12; Madelung, Der Qāsim, p.49.

3. Op. cit. p. 50.

The Batrīya thus allowed the whole tradition of the community to be valid as a proper source for law. In event of any gaps in the said tradition they were to exercise ijtihād.[1] This (positive) attitude of the Batriya towards the tradition of the entire community was based on their thesis that the early community of the Prophet's followers had not fallen into error when they had chosen Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar in place of ᶜAlī as Imam. Thus says Nawbakhtī[2] in their view the Muslims were right in paying homage to them since ᶜAlī himself had paid them homage. They advocated the view that the Imam should be determined by a shūrā of the best of the community who would choose the most excellent (al-afḍal). However they maintained that the choice of the less excellent (al-mafḍūl) was permissible when it could prevent discord and chaos. It must be remembered that although they made these assertions for the shūrā,

---

1. Those who believed in the hereditary Imamate maintained that the Imams were the only authority who were able to guarantee the true tradition of the law. They were thus able to seek the judgement of the Imam for each new question that arose.

2. Nawbakhtī, op. cit. p. 18; Maqālat of al-Ashᶜarī, p. 68. Also see Madelung, Der Qāsim, p. 50.

yet this did not undermine their unqualified preference for ᶜAlī.[1]

This strong emphasis on ᶜAlī's priority was especially prevalent in Iraq, particularly in Kufa, although it did not constitute a united faction. In Nawbakhtī's[2] view they were the original Batrīya. It was from them that a group arose with views expressed earlier as well as with the standpoint that the Imamate belonged of right to any descendant of ᶜAlī when he took the field.[3] This group of Batriya supported the cause of Zayd b. ᶜAlī when he rose in rebellion against the Umayyad Caliph Hisham b. ᶜAbd al-Malik in the year 122 A.H.

---

1. Madelung, op. cit. maintains this is where the Batrīya differ from the Sunnis.
2. Nawbakhtī, p. 18.
3. Nawbakhtī, op. cit. p. 51. Also ref. Madelung, Der Qāsim p. 50.

Jārūdīya

Another group that also supported Zayd's cause but had different views were the Jārūdīya, the followers of Abū al-Jārūd, Ziyād b.Mundhir al-ᶜAbdī.[1] The Jārūdīya were originallysupporters of al-Bāqir, Abū al-Jārūd being a prominent transmitter of his.[2] In Nawbakhtī's opinion even Abū Kẖālid al-Wāsitī and Fuḍayl b. al-Zubayr al-Rassān's followers were among the Jārūdīya. He calls them Surẖūbīya as in his view, Abū al-Jārūd's title "Surẖūb" had been given to him by al-Bāqir which is said to designate "a blind devil dwelling in the sea."[3] Abū Kẖālid and Fuḍayl too were among the transmitters of al-Bāqir.[4]

The Jārūdīya did not recognise Abū Bakr, ᶜUmar and ᶜUthmān in the capacity of Imāms. They declared that

---

1. Masᶜudī, op.cit. p.208; Friedlaender, JAOS, 29 p.22 gives more sources. Baghdādī, p.22.

2. This can be ascertained from al-Murādī's Amālī Aẖmad b. ᶜĪsā, where Abū al-Jārūd narrates numerous traditions from al-Bāqir. Here I would like to acknowledge my gratitude to Prof. Madelung of Oxford University, who kindly lent me his microfilm of this manuscript. Also refer Madelung, Der Qāsim, p. 44.

3. Nawbakhtī, op.cit. pp.45-9. See also al-Rāzī's K. al-Zīna pp. 300-302. For more details on this name see Kashshī, Rijāl, p.150; Shahrastānī Milal, p.119 especially see Strothmann Straatsrecht der Zaiditen (Strasbourg, 1912).

4. Madelung, Der Qāsim, p.44

the Prophet had appointed ᶜAlī as his <u>waṣī</u> and therewith as the legitimate Imām in his place. According to Madelung[1] in Zaydī sources there is in general an ascertainable hesitation from characterizing the first three caliphs as heretics and from cursing them. From Abū Mikhnaf's[2] account it was Zayd's outright refusal to curse Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar which gave the Kūfans the reason or the pretext for deserting him.

Adopting more radical views of al-Bāqir's school, the Jārūdīya rejected the Imamate of the first three caliphs. Writers such as al-Ashᶜarī[3] and Saᶜd b. AbdAllāh[4] maintain that they put forward the nomination of ᶜAlī from the Prophet although Nawbakhtī does not explicitly say that. According to Shahrastānī[4], they held that the Prophet nominated

---

1. Madelung, <u>Der Qāsim</u>, p.45; Arendonk, p.254 says that al-Hādī considers both patriarchs as apostates who deserved death. According to al-Najrī (d.877/1472) cited by Madelung, the early authorities held it unlawful to use the formal blessings for the first three caliphs while others had opposite views. However subsequent authorities, including al-Najrī maintained firmly that the formal blessing could be used for them.

2. al-Ṭabarī, vol.11, pp.1698ff., 1700; also Baghdādī, <u>op.cit</u>. pp 25-26.

3. <u>Maqalat</u>, p.67.

4. Saᶜd b. ᶜAbdAllāh, p:19.

5. <u>Milal</u>, p.118.

ᶜAli "by a description (of his qualities) without the mention of his name."[1] [bi al-waṣf dūna tasmīya] In Zaydī literature,[2] his nomination resulted in a manner that the believers could understand not directly and of necessity but merely by inference.[3] Later this thesis of 'obscure nomination' naṣṣ khafī, ġayr jalī was universally advocated by the Zaydīya.[4]

Holding that the great majority of the Companions of the Prophet had gone astray by following Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar, the Jārūdīya, unlike the Batrīya, rejected the tradition of the law handed down by them.[5] This critical attitude of theirs, which undoubtedly they had adopted from al-Bāqir's school and the attitude of al-Bāqir's school towards the great majority of the early

---

1. Al-Ashᶜarī, Maqālāt, p.67; also refer to Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī's views in al-Hajurī, Raudah, fol. 139a, cited by Madelung, Der Qāsim, p.45. See also Baghdādī, Farq, pp.22 for the same views; Ibn Ḥazm omits the question of Imamate altogether which Friedlaender, JAOS, vol. 29 p.22 regards it strange that he should omit the mention of this typical heterodoxy of the Jārūdīya: the "Tafkīr al-Ṣaḥāba."

2. Abū al-Ḥasan Siyān Sarijān's work Kitāb al-muḥīt min uṣul al-Imāma ᶜalā madhhab al-Zaydīya, cited by Madelung in Der Qāsim, p.45.

3. Al-Bāqir's school on the other hand taught that ᶜAlī's nomination had been clear and directly intelligible. See the chapter, "Al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate".

4. Straatsrecht, p.39, cited by Madelung, op.cit, p.45.

5. Madelung's art on "Imāma", section on Zaydīya, EI².

community of the Prophet's Companions, had a significant effect on the legal pattern.[1] They declared that only the traditions from the Prophet's family were valid. But because of their belief that after al-Ḥusayn the Imamate belongs to any qualified descendant of al-Ḥasan or al-Ḥusayn who calls to his allegiance and rises against the illegitimate rulers, the Jārūdīya relied for religious knowledge also on the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn as a whole, not merely those recognized as Imams.[2] Based on the belief that the Imamate becomes only valid through the formal "call" to allegiance (daᶜwa) and "rising" (khurūj), the Jārūdīya also maintained that those who did not "rise" could not on that account be considered as Imams.[3]

As regards the restriction of the Imamate to the successors of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, this may well have first become the dogma of the majority of Zaydīya at the ᶜAbbāsid conquest. For, towards the end of the Umayyad era, they were still able to support the revolt of ᶜAbdAllāh b. Muᶜāwiya, the great grandson of

---

1. Madelung, Der Qāsim, pp.45ff. More will be said about this in an exclusive chapter on fiqh.

2. Madelung's art. on Imama in EI^2 and also his Der Qāsim, pp. 47ff. For al-Bāqir's school true knowledge could be found only in the recognised Imams.

3. Madelung, Der Qāsim pp. 47ff.

ᶜAlī's brother Jaᶜfar.[1] It is difficult to determine whether the authoritative leaders of the schools were prepared to participate or not. However, it must be said that at least until the 4th/10th century this idea of not limiting the Prophet's family to the descendants of al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, maintained itself still as a Zaydī tendency.[2] Then it had called itself apparently the Ṭālibīya and venerated ᶜAbdAllah b. Muᶜāwiya in the same manner as Zayd b. ᶜAlī. Nabia Abbot[3] maintains that a leader of this group, Ibn ᶜUqda lived as far as the first half of the 3th/9th century and there seems little doubt that he condemned the Imamates of Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar, since he has been labelled as a Jārūdīya.[4]

Nawbakhtī[5] appears quite polemical about their theory maintaining that they had transmitted only a little from Zayd and ᶜAbdAllāh b. Ḥasan while most of their knowledge was from al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq. This statement of his follows certain peculiar dogmas that

---

1. Madelung, Der Qāsim, footnote on p.47. Also see Arendonk, op.cit. p.38, ᶜAbdAllāh b. Muᶜāwiya's revolt in 127 A.H.

2. Madelung, Der Qāsim, fn. p.47.

3. Arabic Papyri I, pp.100, 107ff.

4. Ṭūsī, p.42

5. Firaq, pp.49-50

he attributes to them such as "knowledge grows in their hearts just as rain makes the cultivated land grow."[1] Earlier he maintains that they believed that every descendant of the Prophet, young or old, are all equal in their knowledge, even if they were still in their cradle and that all of them are equally entitled to the Imamate. This is where NawbakhtI[2] adds that inspite of that, they do not transmit any useful knowledge from anyone of them except from al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq and only a few traditions here and there are from Zayd b. ᶜAlI and even fewer from AbdAllāh b. al-Ḥasan al-Mahd.

These beliefs about their knowledge clearly underlie the theory of Inspiration (Ilhām) which al-Jāḥiẓ[3] charged against the Jārūdīya. Madelung[4] maintains that the attribution of this theory to the Jārūdīya probably developed out of a discussion with the followers of al-Bāqir's school, who considered knowledge as an inheritance of their series of Imams and were inclined to charge the Zaydīya that many of their ᶜAlid authorities have not related exclusively from their

---

1. Nawbakhtī Firaq pp. 49-50.
2. ibid.
3. Kitāb faḍīlāt al-Muᶜtazila. See also EI² art. Ilhām.
4. Madelung, Der Qāsim, p.48.

fathers. The Zaydīya on the other hand, in opposition to the Imami Shi^{c}ites in general allowed their ^{c}Alid authorities to relate from non-^{c}Alid transmitters. Thus, their theory of inspiration is slightly modified in that they ascribe to the ^{c}Alids a guaranteed capacity especially from God for the acquisition of knowledge. However in Madelung's[1] opinion there is no apparent trace of such a discussion in the later Zaydī literature.

4. Controversy regarding al-Bāqir's wafat.

The question that arises in this connection is whether Zayd claimed the leadership and stood in rivalry to al-Bāqir in his lifetime or not. This is directly related to the various controversies that have arisen regarding al-Bāqir's conflicting dates of death.[2] The problem becomes even more complex in view of the fact that the historical sources do not delve into doctrinal issues while the heresiographical writers restrict themselves to the latter. Nevertheless, if we are to maintain that Zayd revolted

---

1. Der Qāsim, p.48

2. Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān and al-Kulaynī give it as 114 A.H. while Mas^{c}ūdī puts it as late as 126 A.H. Nawbakhtī mentions 114 A.H. adding that others say it is 119 A.H. Ibn Sa^{c}dand Ya^{c}qūbī place it in in 117 A.H.

in 122 A.H. while the problem between him and Hishām arose in 120 A.H. when he deposed Khālid al-Qasrī and replaced him with Yusūf b. ᶜUmar then taking into account what some of Zayd's supporters said when they cross-examined him and abandoned him[1]; it appears to me at least that al-Bāqir although not alive at the time

---

1. al-Tabari II, 1700

وكانوا يزعمون ان ابا جعفر محمّد بن علي اخا
زيد بن علي هو الامام وكان قد هلك يومئذ —
وكان ابنه جعفر حيًّا فقالوا جعفر امامنا اليوم
بعد ابيه ..... وهو احقّ بالامر بعد ابيه

Van Arendonk in his Les Debuts p.31 thinks it to be strange that the Kūfan Shīᶜites ignored their feelings towards Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar until the last moment when, as Abū Mikhnaf relates, they cross-examined Zayd and abandoned him. However, if one were to look at the history of Kūfans in the past this is not a novel thing and there is nothing strange about them supporting someone until the last moment and then backing out. The same happened at Ṣiffīn, in Ḥasan's struggle against Muᶜawiya and at Karbalā'. In fact even after Karbalā' when Sulayman b. Surad and his group formed the tawwābūn wanting to avenge Ḥusayn's blood, there too, as is known, only one-fourth of those who had initially agreed turned up. Thus there is nothing novel about this attitude of the Kufans, so it is quite likely that they did examine Zayd at the last moment. Moreover, this report in al-Ṭabarī's Tārīkh is being reported by Abū Mikhnaf who was a contemporary of Zayd b. ᶜAlī so it is quite likely that there is very little distortion of facts.

could not have been dead for a very long time.[1] Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān[2] gives an interesting account as to why this group suddenly decided to cross-examine Zayd. It runs as follows:

When Zayd was released after his arrest by Yusūf b. ᶜUmar, his followers encouraged him to rise in rebellion. He confused people with the idea of Khurūj saying that there can be no Imam except he who unsheaths his sword and rises in accordance with the command of Allah, not one who sits at home and lets down the curtains (upon himself). Here the author adds that he meant Abū Jaᶜfar al-Bāqir. The narrative continues saying that when Zayd's affair gained too much popularity, al-Bāqir feared there would be fitna.

---

1. See Hodgson's "How did the Early Shīᶜa become Sectarian JAOS 75 (1955) p. 10. f.n. 60 who uses this line of argument against Strothmann, Staatsrecht, p. 28. Also see his note 61 on the same page where he says "Soon after his (i.e. al-Baqir's death when Zayd's followers abandoned Zayd, they are said to have gone to Jaᶜfar as representing Bāqir's claim.

2. Manāqib, f. 303 ff.

So he chose a trusted follower of his[1] and prepared him with asking certain questions to Zayd. Accordingly this man approached Zayd one day while he was with his group and asked him whether he was claiming what he was in accordance with his father's wishes. Zayd denied this but continued to relate the idea of **khurūj**, mentioned above, to the man. So the man asked him:

> "If no-one amongst you were to rise in rebellion, does it mean then, that there would be no Imam and if a group of people, all were to arise, then would all of them be Imams?"

Zayd, according to the author, is said to have remained silent and those who were present realised the weakness that was there in his claims.

Thereafter the same person who had asked him these questions told Zayd that his brother Abū Jaᶜfar had informed him that their father, ᶜAlī, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn had made the **wasīya** to him, whereupon Zayd retorted:

---

1. The author did not give any names.

"If he had done that he would have surely told me for my father's love for me was such that whenever he shook off the bone-marrow from the bone and found it hot, he would first blow over it before giving it to me, therefore is it possible that he would guard me against the heat of his bone-marrow and not from the heat of hell? He surely would have told me if he had really made the covenant to my brother."

So the man replied:

"Then why is that Prophet Yaᶜqūb warned Yusuf not to relate his dream to his brothers for fear they might conspire against him while he was not asked to conceal the matter from the people."

Thereafter, the author mentions one report saying that Zayd became quiet after this, not being able to reply while the other report maintains that Zayd told them that he was doing what he was doing according to his father's orders.

It was after this incident, continues al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān that some of his followers cross-examined him about Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar's position and then abandoned him. From the Qāḍī's above account of Zayd's revolt it seems that al-Bāqir was still alive at the time when Hishām confronted Zayd with certain allegations and had him arrested and then released.

Nevertheless, before the sequence of these events, he mentions that al-Bāqir passed away in 114 A.H. and later places Zayd's death in 122 A.H. In any case, if we are to maintain that Zayd's actual problem with Hishām arose in 120 A.H. and the revolt took place in 122 A.H., then al-Bāqir's death seems quite possible to have occurred after the conflict in 120 A.H. yet before Zayd's actual revolt in 122 A.H.

Yet another incident given in al-Ṭabarī[1] would place al-Baqir's death to be even later than that - as far as 125 A.H. or even further than that. Someone by the name of ᶜAmr b. ᶜAlī approached al-Bāqir and said to him:

> Hisham has been reigning for a long time and his period of rule has lasted nearly twenty years whereas people claim that Prophet Sulayman had asked his Lord not to let anyone rule more than him, which the people claim to be twenty years.

---

1. al-Ṭabarī <u>Ta'rīkh</u> II 1739-40.

According to al-Ṭabarī, al-Bāqir replied:

> I have no idea of what people talk but I have heard my father, who heard it from his father, from ᶜAlī who heard the Prophet say: God will never let a king in a community of a prophet live as long as that prophet.

If this took place in the year 125 A.H. as mentioned by al-Ṭabarī,[1] this implies that al-Bāqir was still alive at the time, whereas in the same work earlier on, when narrating Zayd's revolt in 122 A.H., he includes Abū Mikhnaf's report about a group abandoning Zayd and approaching Jaᶜfar al-Sadiq as representing al-Bāqir's claims.

However, since the above accounts from Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān and al-Ṭabarī depict a total disregard for chronology and historical circumstances, these cannot be taken as evidence for history and therefore the date of al-Bāqir's death still remains an open question. However one thing appears certain and that is placing al-Bāqir's death in 114 A.H. seems too early while putting it as late as 126 A.H. appears too late.

---

1. ibid.

Unlike Zayd, al-Bāqir never thought of resorting to the sword. Instead, people were attracted to him on account of his extensive knowledge that had earned him the title of al-Bāqir al-ᶜIlm. His noble birth, primogeniture and his personality played no smaller role in establishing his position and gaining him followers. More than this, his views on the Imamate had a significant impact upon some of the people who became permanently attached to him and his family. In contrast to Zayd and his supporters, al-Bāqir's school maintained that the institution of the Imamate was hereditary in nature and did not depend on the khurūj of the Imām as held by them. Thus al-Bāqir was introducing the idea of a non-rebelling Imamate. This was significant and timely as many had come to believe by then that the point of claiming Imamate was to bid for power, that is, political powers.

A stronger argument in favour of al-Bāqir's school was their conviction that the Prophet had expressly designated and appointed ᶜAlī as his successor before his death by nass i.e. by means of explicit

designation.[1] This meant that as the Prophet had sanctioned ᶜAlī's appointment, the succession of Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar was an invalid usurpation. It must be pointed out, however, that al-Bāqir was never known to have reviled the two caliphs, at least not in public.[2] The tradition in Ibn Saᶜd[3] says that when asked if any one from among the Prophet's family spoke ill of the two caliphs, al-Bāqir replied that one the contrary they had always loved them, followed them in succession and 'prayed for them' or 'asked for forgiveness for them' istaqhfara lahumā.

---

1. See section on theology of the Imamate in Chapter Four 'Al-Bāqir's views on the Imamate.'

2. Dhahabī Tārīkh iv p. 300; Abū Nuᶜaym Hilyāt III 185. Some Kufans maintained that al-Bāqir only concealed his real opinion by using the principle of precautionary dissimulation (taqīya). Traditions referring to the peot Kumayt quote al-Bāqir as very violently disavowing Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar see Kashshī Rijāl, pp. 205 ff. whereas Kumayt himself never vilified the first two caliphs openly. See Hāshimīyāt, p. 155.

   Dāᶜī Idris in his ᶜUyūn al-Akhbār pp. 239 ff has an interesting account of al-Bāqir's debates with the Harūrīya on the question of ᶜAlī's rights and denial of Abū Bakr's. Dāᶜī Idrīs does not mention his source but it has got to be other than his usual one i.e. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān for the latter does not mention this at least in his Sharḥ or his Manāqib.

3. Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt V p. 321.

Al-Bāqir, by insisting on the nass of the Imam, meant that the Imam had the authority from above and not from any human electors or from the bayᶜa (pledge of allegiance) of the ordinary people. Furthermore, since the Imam's authority was from above, 'true knowledge was confined only to the Imam in the Prophet's family; not to every member of the Prophet's family and certainly not to the whole Community. It was thus, he held, that the whole tradition of the Community was not valid as a proper source for law. This also meant that he did not allow the practice of ijtihād and ikhtiyār nor did he advocate individual opinions (arā') which the Baṭrīya did. For, the Imam's followers would be able to seek the judgement of the Imam on each new question that arose being the only authority able to guarantee the true tradition of law. This was possible because the inspired Imam was the recipient of that special sum of knowledge (ᶜIlm) handed down to him

which was hereditary and which was the exclusive right of each succeeding Imam.

CHAPTER FOUR

AL-BĀQIR'S VIEWS ON THE IMAMATE

(i) Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate

In the discussion of the nature and basis of the Imamate, Shīᶜite sources[1] suggest that al-Bāqir laid great emphasis on the Qur'ānic verse 5:55 :-

انما ولیکم اللہ ورسولہ والذین امنوا الذین
یقیمون الصلوۃ ویوتون الزکوۃ وھم راکعون

This verse can either be translated as:-

> "Indeed your [real] Protector or Guardian is only God, His Messenger and those believers who perform prayer and give the zakāt while prostrating."

---

1. al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān, Daᶜā'im al-Islām I pp. 17ff. al-Kulaynī, al-Uṣūl min al-Kāfī I p.289; al-Ṭabarsī al-Shaykh Abī ᶜAlī al-Faḍl b. al-Ḥasan, Majmūᶜ al-Bayān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān, Vol.3 (Teheran,1395 A.H) pp. 209 ff. Ismāᶜīlī sources such as Al-Risāla fī al-Imāma of Abū al-Fawāris Aḥmad b. Yaᶜqūb (daᶜi during al-Hakim's reign who became the Imam in 386/996) p.13 in the edition of S.N. Makarem (Beirut, 1977) and al-Maṣābīḥ fī Ithbāt al-Imama of another daᶜi of al-Ḥākim, Aḥmad Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Kirmānī (d.c.411/1021) edited by Mustafa Ghālib (Beirut, 1969) p.111 both mention this Qur'ānic verse (although not mentioning al-Baqir's name) as being one of the proofs for the validity of ᶜAlī's divine appointment. This verse is also given in Tafsīr al-Qummī I p. 170 and Tafsīr al-Tibyān of Ṭūsī III, pp. 549ff. where al-Bāqir has commented upon it.

or as:

> "Indeed your [real] Protector of Guardian is only god, His Messenger and those believers who perform prayer and give the zakāt, and they are the ones who prostrate."[1]

These two alternate translations depend on one single letter i.e. the wāw which besides being a conjunction [wāw al-ᶜatf] can also be grammatically used in this position to introduce the state a person was in when performing the action in the previous clause [wāw al-hāl]. The first translation of the verse takes the hāl into account while the second one ignores it. Both these translations involve significant implications. If the hāl is rejected, that would mean all the believers are fit enough to b the walī whereas if the hāl is accepted then, besides God and His Messenger, the walāya is restricted to only those believers who give zakāt while still prostrating in prayer.

Muslim exegetes[2] over the years have had contradictory views regarding this verse. Some[3]

---

1. ᶜAbdAllāh Yusūf ᶜAlī in his translation of the Holy Qur'an has adopted this alternative. See Chapter 5, verse 58 on page 261.

2. See the varying reports given in al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr, Vol.5-6 pp.285ff and in al-Ṭūsī, Tafsir al-Tibyān, Vol.3 pp.549ff.

3. ᶜUtba b. Abī Ḥakam and Mujāhid, see Ṭabarī, op.cit.

believe it is in reference to ᶜAlī who, while kneeling down in prayer, once threw his ring[1] to a beggar who stood asking for alms. Whereas others maintain that the verse really refers merely to believers. They maintain that the verse was revealed when ᶜUbāda b. al-Ṣāmit freed himself from the patronage and alliance of the Banū Qaynuqa and went over to the Messenger and believers.[2] Still others, like Ibn al-Kalbī think it was revealed concerning ᶜAbdAllah b. Salām and his companions when they became Muslims and the Jews broke off their contract of clientage (muwālāt).[3]

Commenting on the above verse, al-Bāqir[4],

---

1. al-Kulaynī Kāfī I p.289 says that ᶜAlī threw a garment (ḥulla) rather than a ring to the beggar. This garment had been given to him by the Prophet who had received it as a gift from the King of Abyssinia. The value of this garment, says al-Kulaynī, was one thousand dīnārs. Al-Kulaynī appears to be an exception in holding this view for all other scholars, including twelvers like al-Ṭabarsī, Vol.3 pp.209ff say it was a ring. See also al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, Vol.5-6 pp.285 ff. AL-Bayḍāwī, Anwār al-Tanzīl wa Asrār al-Ta'wīl I, p.263.

2. Hannād b. al-Sarī reporting from ᶜUbāda b. al-Ṣāmit himself and Abū Kurayb reporting again from ᶜUbāda himself. See Ṭabarī Tafsir, vol.5-6 pp.285ff.

3. al-Tusi, Tafsīr al-Tibyān p.549. Note that the word muwalāt can have different meanings in different contexts.

4. Tafsīr al-Qummī, Vol.1, p.170, al-Qummī was a younger contemporary of al-Ṭabarī. See also al-Ṭūsī, Tafsīr al-Tibyān, Vol. 3 pp.549 ff: al-Ṭabarsi, Majmūᶜ al-Bayān, vol.3, pp.209 ff.

categorically maintains that it was revealed at the time when the Messenger was with a group of Jews, amongst whom ᶜAbdAllāh b. al-Salām was present. As soon as the verse was revealed the Messenger got up and walked towards the mosque where he met a beggar. Inquiring if anyone had given him anything, the beggar pointed at a man who was still praying. That man turned out to be ᶜAlī.

However, what we read of al-Bāqir's view point according to two of his traditions mentioned by al-Ṭabarī is quite different from the accounts in al-Qummī, al-Ṭūsī and al-Ṭabarsī. In al-Ṭabarī's account[1] when al-Bāqir is asked: "Who are those who believe" in the above mentioned verse, his reply is al-ladhīna āmanū i.e. those who believe. When the group cornered him by saying that they had heard it was revealed in reference to ᶜAlī, al-Bāqir gave an equivocal reply: "ᶜAlī is among those who believe."

Al-Ṭabarī's selection of reports on this verse is very fascinating and revealing. He puts forward the varying reports alongside each other without weighing them up, sometimes using the same authority to narrate

---

1. al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr, Vol.5-6, p.286.

contrary views.[1] It is interesting to find al-Ṭabarī using al-Bāqir's traditions twice to deny the Shīᶜite position and the fact that he does that would suggest that there had been some early arguments about al-Bāqir's position. Moreover, the two traditions used by al-Ṭabarī have a common person in the isnād[2] which is regarded as being a problematic isnād by some critics.[3]

There seems to be therefore a strong evidence that the verse was regarded by some as referring to ᶜAlī; for even al-Ṭabarī, despite his use of traditions ascribed to Abū Jaᶜfar (i.e. al-Bāqir) to the contrary, has to include a number of traditions indicating that the verse does refer to ᶜAlī.

But the question arises how can it mean a single person when the form used in the verse is in the plural : -al-ladhīna yuqīmūna al-ṣalāt .. Al-Ṭūsī's arguments for this problem are taken directly from the Qur'an

---

1. For instance he reports from Ḥannād b. al-Sarī, the traditions of both, ᶜUbāda and Abū Jaᶜfar, i.e. al-Bāqir. See al-Ṭabari, Tafsīr, Vol.5-6 p.286.

2. Which is ᶜAbd al-Malik. Among al-Bāqir's companions in Rijāl al-Barqī there are two persons mentioned under this name: (i) ᶜAbd al-Malik b. ᶜAṭā' and (ii) ᶜAbd al Malik b. ᶜAyan, mawla of Banū Shaybān.

3. For more details on this, see Schacht's Origins of Muhammadan Jurisprudence, p. 163 ff.

where not only God refers to Himself in the plural[1] but also there are a number of other verses where the plural is used when actually only a single person is meant. For instance verse 173 of sūra Āl-ʿImrān says:-

الـــذيـــن قـــال لـهـــم الـنـاس ان الـنـــاس قـد جـمـعـوا لكـــم ...

"Those to whom the people said: Indeed the people have gathered for you ..."

There is no dispute among the exegetes that the plural form in the above verse actually refers to one man and that is Nuᶜaym b. Maṣᶜud al-Ashjāᶜī. Among other such verses[2] is verse 168 of the same sūra Al-Imrān:

الـــذيـــن قـــالـــوا لاخـــــوانـــــهم

وقـــعـــدوا لـــو اطـــاعـــونـــا مـاقـتـلـوا ....

"Those who say about their brethren [who were slain] while they themselves sat [at ease] : If only they had obeyed us they would not have been killed."

انا نحـــن نزلـــنـــا الذكـــر وانـــا لـــه لحـــافـــظـــون .

1. We have indeed sent down the Message and We shall certainly be its Guardian [Sūra 15 : 9]. If We had

ولـــو شـــئـنـــا لآتـيـــنـــا كـــل نفـــس هداهـــــــا ..

If We had willed, We could certainly have brought every soul its true guidance [Sūra 12: 172]

2. Another example is II : 199.

Then move on quickly from where people move on .... Again here the person meant was the Messenger. Cf. Ṭūsī, p.552

In the above verse too, although the plural is used, the exegetes opine that it was revealed about ᶜAbdAllāh b. Ubayy b. Salūl. Thus there is no reason why the plural form in verse 5:55 could not have been meant for a single person and that is ᶜAlī b. Abī Ṭālib. Moreover, since God used the word <u>walī</u> and not <u>awliyā'</u> in the first place, it suggests that only a single person was actually meant.

However, what emerges from the Shīᶜite sources[1] is the fact that in al-Bāqir's view, the Messenger had been reluctant to explain this <u>walāya</u> of ᶜAlī to the believers. It is reported that a man approached al-Bāqir saying to him that al-Ḥasan al-Basrī[2] (d.c. 110 A.H.) had told him that the Messenger had received a certain message and when he hesitated to deliver it to the people God threatened him with punishment if he did not do so. Then al-Bāqir asked the questioner whether al-Ḥasan had told him what the message was. He said: No, whereupon al-Bāqir told him: "By God, he certainly knows what the message was, but has deliberately concealed it."[3] The questioner then asked al-Baqir to clarify the message.

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān <u>Daᶜā'im</u> I, pp.17ff; al-Kulaynī <u>Kāfī</u> I, p.289.

2. He was a contemporary of al-Bāqir.

3. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān <u>Daᶜā'im</u> I, p.17

Explaining this message, al-Bāqir said that just as the Messenger had elucidated the details[1] regarding the verses on prayer, alms giving, fasting and pilgrimage, so too, he was expected to expound on the walāya that was revealed in the aforementioned verse. But when asked to do that, the Messengers felt extremely uneasy fearing that people would apostatize. As his reluctance continued, God repeated the command in verse 5:67.

يا أيها الرسول بلغ
ما أنزل اليك من ربك
وان لم تفعل فما بلغت رسالته
والله يعصمك من الناس.

"O Messenger, deliver (to the people) what has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you did not do so then, you have not delivered His message, and Allah will protect you from the people."

---

1. Details such as how and when to pray, how much zakāt was to be given, when to fast and how long for as well as how and when to do the pilgrimage.

Al-Bāqir continued relating to the questioner that the Messenger, upon receiving this verse then carried out God's command and endorsed the walāya[1] or Imamate of ᶜAlī b. Abī Ṭālib at Ghadīr Khumm[2]. The Sunni commentators obviously do not interpret the verse so as to mean that God's Message is only truly conveyed by the appointment of an Imam. By "that which has been revealed" they understand the whole Book, i.e. that the Prophet should not omit any verse out of fear or caution.[3]

Al-Ṭabarī starts off by giving his interpretation that the revelation was regarding those stories which God had enumerated about the Jews and the Christians. Since these passages involved their shortcomings and their faults as well as their tampering with the scripture, the Messenger in al-Ṭabarī's view was apprehensive about revealing the message in full. That

---

1. Other Shīᶜite sources on the exegesis of this verse tally with views expressed by al-Bāqir in Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān's K.al Walāya. See Tafsīr al-Qummī p.171 and al-Ṭūsī's Tafsīr al Tibyān pp. 574 ff. Ṭūsī begins by giving different versions and then in the end, reports on the authority of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq that this verse was revealed to the Messenger as an encouragement to deliver what had already been revealed to him before.

2. See for more details L. Veccia Vaglieri art."Ghadīr Khumm" in EI^2. For more references see the section on 'Traditional basis of the Imamate' where the event is dealt with in detail.

3. See al-Bayḍāwī, Anwār 1:367

is the reason for the revelation of this verse he believes. Nevertheless, he goes on to give varying reports that the Prophet had concealed something while also quoting traditions from ᶜĀ'isha to say that whoever says that the Prophet had concealed something of the revelation is a liar. Al-Ṭabarī then adds that the commentators are divided regarding the cause for this revelation. Some say that it was because a bedouin wanted to kill the Messenger and therefore God said He would protect him while others say he used to be afraid of the Quraysh.[1]

However, according to al-Bāqir it was only after the endorsement of walāya that God revealed the following verse, 5:3:-

اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم
وأتممت عليكم نعمتي
ورضيت لكم الاسلام دينا .

"This day I have perfected your faith for you and completed my favours upon you and have chosen for you Islam as a faith/religion."

---

1 . Al-Ṭabarī, Tafsīr Vol. 10 (Cairo, 1960) pp. 465 ff.

Al-Bāqir's position reported from various Shīᶜite sources[1] regarding the above verse "Al-yawm akmaltu lakum..." is very clear and that is, it was revealed on the occasion of ᶜAlī's appointment as an Imam at Ghadīr Khumm.[2] Al-Ṭabarī not only excludes reports in favour of the Shīᶜite position but goes on to include certain traditions to deny their position. It is also noteworthy that all

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I pp. 17-18; al-Kulaynī, Kāfī I, p. 289, see also Tafsīr al Qummī I, p. 162; Tafsīr al-Tibyān of al-Ṭūsī III, pp. 435 ff. and Majmū al-Bayān of al-Ṭabarsī II-III, pp. 159 ff. See also Abū Ḥātim al=Rāzī K. al-Zīna in al-Sāmarā'ī's edition, pp. 256 ff. where this is reported from his son, al-Ṣādiq.

2. Sunni commentators like al-Bayḍāwī do not believe this verse was issued then nor do they explain "the perfection of religion" and completion of God's favour or blessings" as referring to the appointment of an Imam after the Prophet. Al-Bayḍāwī commenting on this verse says: "Today I have perfected your religion for you" means either that God has perfected your religion with victory and distinction over all other religions, or with defining the foundations of the doctrine and acquainting the believers with the principles of the laws and the rules of legal judgment. "I have completed my blessings upon you" means that God has completed His blessings upon you with guidance and success or with the perfection of religion or with the conquest of Mecca and the destruction of the pale of Jāhilīya. See Bayḍāwī Anwār I, p. 247.

these traditions are on the authority of Ibn ᶜAbbās.[1] Commenting on the varying reports al-Ṭabarī maintains that the correct reports are those that say that God informed His Prophet and thereby the faithful that He had perfected their faith on the day this verse was revealed by making the sacred country exclusive for them and excluding the idolators so that the believers may make the pilgrimage without having to mix with them.

---

1. al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr, Vol. 9 pp. 518 and 521.
(a)

حدثني المثنى قال ، حدثنا عبد الله قال حدثني معاوية عن علي عن ابن عباس قوله "اليوم اكملت لكم دينكم "وهو الاسلام . قال أخبر الله نبيه صلى الله عليه وسلم والمؤمنين أنه قد أكمل لهم الايمان فلا يحتاجون الى زيادة ابدا ، وقد اتمه الله عز ذكره فلا ينقصه ابدا ، وقد رضيه الله فلا يسخطه ابدا .

(b)

حدثني المثنى قال ، حدثنا عبد الله قال ، حدثنا معاوية عن علي ، عن ابن عباس قال المشركون والمسلمون يحجون جميعا ، فلما نزلت "براءة "نفى المشركين عن البيت وحج المسلمون لا يشاركهم في البيت الحرام احد من المشركين ، فكان ذلك من تمام النعمة : "واتممت عليكم نعمتي " .

Another Qur'ānic verse used by al-Bāqir[1] to emphasise the walāya of the Imams is 4:59:-

يأيها الذين آمنوا
اطيعوا الله واطيعوا الرسول
واولي الامر منكم ....

translated as:-

> O Ye who believe! Obey God and obey the Messenger and those who hold authority [from] amongst you .....

This verse is even more controversial than the ones already mentioned; the obvious problem being the identity of the ulī al-amr. Numerous reports[2] have come down to us giving varied suggestions, some maintaining that they are 'the rulers' while others believing them to be the scholars. Al-Bāqir's[3] commentary on this verse is that the ulī al-amr are the Imams from the family of Muḥammad, although a tradition

---

1. Qāḍī Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I, p.31.

2. See al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr Vol. 5 pp. 146 ff. and al-Ṭūsī; Tafsīr al-Tibyān, Vol. 3, pp. 235 ff. According to Ibn Yaᶜqūb, the author of al-Risāla fī al Imama p. this phrase Ulī al-Amr (those in authority) refers only to ᶜAlī b. Ṭālib because the Prophet appointed him to be in authority even during his lifetime when the latter left for his Tabuk expedition. He says that obedience to ᶜAlī is a requirement because in the Arabic language the letter alif and lām (al) are used for specification

3. al-Ṭūsī op.cit.; al-Ṭabarsī, Majmaᶜ Vol. 2-3 p. 64. In Tafsīr al-Qummī Vol. I the tradition is from al-Bāqir's son, al-Ṣādiq.

from his son, al-Ṣādiq found in al-Ṭabarī says that they are the scholars. Al-Ṭabarī in his commentary also includes reports which maintain that the ūlī al-amr were Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar[1]. At the same time he excludes traditions in favour of ᶜAlī and his family.

However, the matter does not end there, for, the line following the ūlī al-amr entails serious problems for the Shīᶜite position. It runs as follows:-

فان تنازعتم في شيء فردوه الى الله والرسول ان
كنتم تؤمنون بالله واليوم الآخر ذلك خير
وأحسن تأويلا .

This is translated as:-

"If you differ about anything, then refer it to God and His Messenger if you are [truly] believers in God and the Hereafter. That is better and more seemly in the end."

In answer to this, al-Bāqir uses another Qur'ānic verse 4:83:- ولو ردوه الى الرسول والى اولي الامر منهم لعلمه الذين يستنبطونه منهم .

---

1. See al-Ṭabarī Vol 5 pp. 146 ff. where the following are found:-

قال آخرون : هم ابو بكر وعمر رضي الله عنهما حدثنا احمد بن عمرو البصري قال : ثنا حفص بن عمر العدني ، قال : ثنا الحكم بن ابان عن عكرمة "اطيعوا الله واطيعوا الرسول واولي الامر منكم "قال ابو بكر وعمر .

which means:-

> "If they had only referred it to the Messenger and those who had authority among them, then those among them who derive [or extract knowledge] would have perceived it."

Using the above verse to reassert the position of the Imams, al-Bāqir maintains that obedience to the Imams is incumbent as God made them 'the people of knowledge' and enabled them to extract that knowledge.[1]

It is interesting to note that even al-Ṭabarī has a tradititon from one of the earliest exegetes, Mujāhid (d.c. 100 A.H.)[2] to strengthen the position of <u>ūlī al amr</u>:-

حدثنا ابو كريب ، قال : ثنا ابن ادريس ، قال : اخبرنا ليث عن مجاهد في قوله "فان تنازعتم في شيء" فردوه الى الله والرسو لَ قال : فان تنازع العلماء" ردوه الى الله والرسول ، قال : يقول : فردوه الى كتاب الله وسنة رسوله ، ثم قرأ مجاهد هذه الآية : ولو ردوه الى الرسول والى اولي الامر منهم لعلمه الذين يستنبطونه منهم .

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān <u>Daᶜā'im al-Islām</u> I p. 31 al-Ṭūsī <u>Tafsīr al-Tibyān</u>, p.236.

2. al-Ṭabarī <u>Tafsīr</u> Vol. 8 pp. 504-5

According to Shīᶜite sources[1] when al-Bāqir was asked about the verse: Obey God, obey the Messenger and those who hold authority amongst you (ūlī al-amr), he responded by giving a long survey of Qur'ānic allusions to the Imams. He said:

> "Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Book believing in sorcery and evil [saying] to the unbelievers that they are better guided than those who believe"[2]

Explaining this verse, he says that such people claim that the leaders of error and those who urge people to hell-fire are better guided than the family of Muhammad. He adds another verse, "they are those whom God has cursed and those whom God will curse and you will find (that they) have no helper",[3] "or have they a share in the Kingdom (mulk) (which according to according to al-Baqir means the Imamate and the Caliphate)[4] Behold! they give not even a speck on the date-stone to the people".[5] Al-Bāqir,[6] then commented that they were 'the people'

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I pp. 25-30 al-Kulayni Kāfī Vol. I pp. 205-206

2. Qur'ān 4:51

3. Ibid 4:52

4. "We have already given the family of Abraham the Book and Wisdom and conferred upon them a great kingdom" i.e. We made from them Messengers, Prophets and Imams.

5. 4:53

6. See Qāḍī al-Nucmān Dacā'im I pp. 17 ff; al-Kulaynī Kāfī I p. 205

whom God meant in the above verse. He went on to give another Qur'ānic verse, 4:54:-

> "Or do they envy the people for what God has bestowed upon them of His bounty?"

and said that they were the ones envied by the people because of the favour of the Imamate which God bestowed upon them apart from all other creatures.

Referring to another verse 4.58

> "Lo, Allāh has commanded you that you that you restore deposits to their owners ...."

al-Baqir said, it is the Imams who were meant there and that they are the ones who have to give to their succesors the special books, the special knowledge (<u>ʿIlm</u>) and the weapons of the Prophet. They are the truthful ones referred to in the Qur'ān[1] as well as "the believers"[2]. God has made the Imams, according to al-Bāqir's interpretation of verse 2:143 an <u>umma wasaṭ</u> so that they can be God's witnesses to his creatures. His definition of "a great kingdom conferred upon the family of Abrāhām"[3] is that God made from among them leaders whose obedience was equal to God being obeyed

---

1. 9:119
2. 9:105
3. 4:54

and whose disobedience was equal to the disobedience of God. Then argues al-Bāqir, how could people accept that in the family of Abrāhām and deny it in the family of Muḥammad?

The Imams he adds, are the chosen ones and are named as 'those who submitted' not only in the Qur'an but also in the earlier scriptures.[1] Since they have been endowed with knowledge from God, the Imams, says al-Bāqir[2] have the clear signs of God in their hearts and since they are the ahl al-dhikr, i.e. the people of the Message[3] they are ones who should be questioned about its interpretation.

The Prophet, continues al-Bāqir[4], was a warner to his people and in every age there is an Imam to guide

---

1. Al-Bāqir referring to verses 22:77-78 in Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān op. cit.; See also al-Kulaynī Kāfī I 205-6

2. Quoting verse 29:49 'Nay, here are Signs self-evident in the hearts of those endowed with knowledge.'

3. Referring to verse 43:44 in Qāḍi al-Nuᶜmān op. cit. al-Kulaynī Kāfī I 210-211.

4. According to his interpretation of verse 13:7

> "You are (only) a Warner and for every people there is a guide"

See Qāḍī al-Nuᶜman Daᶜā'im I p. 28; al-Kulaynī Kāfī I 191-2

his people to what the Prophet brought. The first of these guides after the Prophet was ᶜAlī and then his awṣiyā', inheritors, after him. Al'Bāqir, then, went on to add yet another Qur'ānic verse 3:5:-

> "And No-one knows its interpretation
> except God and those firmly rooted
> in ᶜIlm (knowledge)"

Commenting on the above verse[1], al-Bāqir said that the Messenger was the best of those firmly rooted in knowledge. God taught him regarding all that was revealed to him and how to interpret it. Thereafter, it is the Imams who know all the interpretation of the Qur'ān. The Imams are, according to his interpretation of verse 35:32,[2] the chosen servants of God who have been given the Qur'ān as an inheritance. The foremost of the people in performing good deeds are the Imams, those who follow the middle course are the people who acknowledge the right of the Imam, and those who wrong themselves are the ones who do not accept the Imams.

---

1. Qadi al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I p.28

2. "Then we gave the scripture as inheritance to those whom we chose among our worshippers. But among them are some who wrong themselves and some who follow the mid-road while some outstrip (others) through good deeds by Allah's leave. That is the great favour"

   See Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I p.29

Concluding his long survey of Qur'ānic allusions to the Imams, al-Bāqir[1] pointed out to the questioner that the non-Shīᶜa claim the above verse to have been revealed for them. He then argues that if it were revealed concerning all of them, then all of them would be the chosen ones and in fact all would go to paradise (which is hardly the case). Likewise, he went on, they claimed regarding the ta'wīl of the earlier verse (of ..... ūlī al-amr) with which we began.

Love for the Imams

Al Bāqir maintained that not only obedience to the Imams was incumbent upon the believers but that love for them was a duty enjoined upon the worshippers according to verse 42:22:-

> "...Say, I do not ask for any reward except love for my kith and kin ..."[2]

However, he adds, that the community differs with regard to the interpretation of this verse. There are

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I pp. 29ff.

2. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān, Daᶜā'im pp. 84 ff. See also his Kitāb al-Himma fi Adab Atibāᶜ al-A'imma ed. by Mustafa Ghalib (Beirut 1979) p.25 where al-Bāqir adds: "He who loves us, Allah will raise him with us on the Day of Resurrection." Then he went on to say: "Is religion anything but love." Also see al-Tabarsī, Majmaᶜ al-Bayān Vol. 9-10 pp. 27-28. Al-Baydāwī Anwār al-Tanzīl II p. 230 says that this was revealed regarding ᶜAlī, Fāṭima and their two sons. However, he ends by saying that this verse is also said to have been revealed in reference to Abū Bakr.

four different groups upholding different views. One group believes what we believe i.e. this verse was in fact revealed for the Ahl al-Bayt of the Messenger of Allah. The second group insists that this verse was abrogated by another one saying:

> "Say, whatever I ask you with regard to my reward, it is (actually) for you. I rely for my reward on no-one except God and He is witness to everything."[1]

Refuting their position, al-Bāqir argues[2] that the above verse could only have been revealed either before the first one or after it. If it was revealed before, then, obviously it cannot cancel or abrogate the verse that has been revealed after it. On the other hand if it was revealed after the verse of "love for relations," then this later verse makes the first verse all the more emphatic since the love for the relations which the Prophet has asked from the believers does him really no good but the believers. Hence the verse reads:

> "Say whatever I ask you in way of return, is meant for you ..."

---

1. See Da^{c}ā'im pp. 84 ff. Sura 34:49

2. ibid. See also for the same point of view, Muscati and Moulvi, Life and Lectures of al-Mu'ayyad (Karachi 1950), pp.135-136 where some of al-Majālis al-Mu'ayyadīya which consists of eight hundred majalis in eight volumes, are summarised.

Al-Bāqir continues that the third group holds that this verse was meant for all the Arabs as the Prophet had a relation in every Arab house. They said that the Prophet had asked them to love him that is to love him through them. Al-Bāqir argues that if those whom he asked were believers then they would love him for their faith in him and their belief in him, so why would God be gracious upon them regarding that. On the contrary if those whom He is addressing are unbelievers, then how can he ask them for reward in a thing which they do not believe in. Moreover al-Bāqir says that restricting "the believers" only to the Arabs is ignorance on their part as well as being clearly presumptious. Not only that, al-Bāqir adds, it is misconstruing the Book of God and distorting His words, for the verse is addressed to all the believers, Arabs as well as non-Arabs, and all those who believe in God and Prophet; all of them have been enjoined to love the relations of His Prophet.

The fourth group, says al-Bāqir, holds that this verse meant gaining God's proximity through His obedience. This, al-Bāqir says, is the farthest in meaning as well as the most remote of the interpretations which has been reported from al-Ḥasan al-Basrī. Arguing his point of view al-Bāqir then says that if the verse meant what this misconstruer of God's words (<u>al-muharrif li kalām Allāh</u>) says then, there was

no point in mentioning words such as 'love' and 'reward'. Despite what the misconstruer of God's words says here, he goes on to report a tradition from Ibn ᶜAbass was asked when the Prophet was asked who were relations he replied: ᶜAlī, Fāṭima and their two sons.[1]

Imams are the Light of God (Nūr Allāh)

Al-Bāqir said that the Imams are the Light of God mentioned in various verses of the Qur'ān such as : "And believe in Allah and His Messenger and the Light that We have brought down."[2] Another such verse is 28:28:

> "O! Ye who believe, Fear God and believe in His Apostle and He will bestow upon you a double portion of His mercy; He will provide for you a light by which ye shall walk ..."[3]

The Imams, al-Bāqir said, are the light which guides men along the path of righteousness. They illuminate the hearts of the believers in whom the Imam's light is brighter than the bright sunlight during day time. Interpreting another verse of the Qur'ān 6:122:

---

1. Daᶜā'im, pp.84 ff.
2. Sura 44:8. See Kulaynī al-Kāfī, 194.
3. See al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, Vol. I p.194

> "Is he who was dead and We raised him unto life and set for him a light that would walk in the midst of men, similar to him who is in utter darkness from which there is no way out ..."[1]

Al-Bāqir said that 'the dead' meant those who did not know anything while 'the light that walks amidst people' meant the Imam who guides and 'those in darkness from which there is no way out' meant those who do not know the Imam[2].

According to Al-Ṭabarī this verse was revealed in connection with two men, one, a believer and another, a non-believer. Then he goes on to say that the exegetes differ with regard to the believer who some say it was ᶜUmar b. al-Khattāb[3] while others believe him to be ᶜAmmār b. Yāsir.[4] The non-believer is said to have been Abū Jahl b. Hishām.

Continuing his commentary al-Ṭabarī gives other traditions to say that some believe 'the dead'meant those who had gone astray and 'we raised them to life'

---

1. See Daᶜā'im, p.214, and al- Kulaynī, op.cit p.185.
2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī Vol.I p.185
3. al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr, Vol.12 p.90. He supports this with one tradition.
4. ibid. He includes two traditions for this view.

meant we guided them and 'the light' was the right guidance. He then gives variant reports that the light in the midst of men was the Qur'ān or the right guidance or Islam. He does not however report any tradition in favour of the Imam's position given in Shīᶜite sources.[1]

The Hereditary character of the Imamate

Al-Bāqir emphasized that the Imamate remained in the progeny of the Imams. This was according to his interpretation of Sūra 33:6 ... "Those related by blood are nearer to one another in the book of God."[2] He further explained that this verse was revealed especially with regard to the children of Ḥusayn. Another such verse describing Imamic succession is 43:28:- "And He made it a word to continue in his posterity that they may return."[3]

---

1. See Daᶜā'im. I p.214 and al-Kulaynī Kāfī I, p.185. It is intereting to note that al-Ṭabarsī Majmū' al-Bayān, vol. 3-4 pp.358-360 does not say that the light were the Imams but gives different traditions to say it was either knowledge and wisdom or the Qur'ān or Faith. Another common Qur'anic verse interepreted for the Imams being the light of God is verse 35 of Sūra al-Nūr namely, "God is the Light of the heavens and the earth..." See Kitāb al-Kashf, pp.16-17 of Jaᶜfar b. Manṣūr al-Yaman. Also see Tafsīr al Qummī II, pp.102 ff.

2. See al-Kāfī I, p.288 for the details of the tradition reported in al-Bāqir's authority.

3. See Tafsīr al-Qummī II, p.274 where the tradition is narrated on the authority of al-Bāqir's son, al-Ṣādiq who interpreting this verse says that it meant the Imamate.

ᶜIṣma

Another aspect of the Imamate which al-Bāqir put forward was the ᶜIṣma[1] (infallibility) of the Imam i.e. he was divinely protected from sin and error (maᶜṣum). This too, is based on his interpretation of Qur'anic verse 33:33.

> "And God only wishes to remove uncleanliness far from you O, People of the House (Ahl al-Bayt) and cleanse you with a thorough cleansing or to purify you thoroughly."[2]

This verse is accepted by some Sunni scholars[3] as well to have been revealed for Hazrat ᶜAlī, Fāṭima, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn.

Shafāᶜa

Closely related to the concept of ᶜiṣma is the notion of shafāᶜa i.e. intercession which is inherent in the theory of Imamate propounded by al-Bāqir. There

---

1. Literally the word ᶜiṣma and maᶜṣum are derived from the verb ᶜaṣama which, according to Lane, means prevented, hindered, protected, defended, preserved, withheld etc. So ᶜiṣma is prevention, hindrance, defence, protection; the Shiᶜa explain it as protection from sin and is a specific quality of the Imams. See Majmaᶜ al-Baḥrayn, an Arabic (Shīᶜite) lexicon, by Fakhr al-Dīn b. Muhammad b. Ahmad al-Najafī (Tehran, 1321 A.H.) under ᶜasama. Also see EI² art. "ᶜiṣma". Donaldson in his Shīᶜite Religion, gives a detailed account of ᶜiṣma, see pp. 320-338.

2. Tafsīr al-Qummī II, p. 193. The report includes other details such as whether the Ahl al-Bayt included the Prophet's wives or not.

3. Ibn Kathir, Tafsir al-Qur'an al-ᶜAzim (Cairo, 1971). There are, of course, others who hold that it refers to the wives of the Prophet.

are many Qur'ānic verses mentioned above which al-Bāqir has interpreted, some of which imply the intercessional powers of the Imam. One of them is "on the day when we shall call all men with their Imam..."[1]

Commenting on this verse, al-Bāqir said that when this verse was revealed, the Muslims asked the Messenger whether he was not the Imam for all the people. The Messenger said that he was the Messenger of Allah for all the people but after him there would be the Imams from his family who would stay with the people but who would not be accepted but instead would be oppressed. However, those who would love them, follow them and believe in them were indeed from him and would meet him while those who oppressed them and called them liars were not from him and he would in fact disown them.[2]

---

1. Qur'ān 7:17. See also al-Kāfī I, p. 215.
2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī, Vol. I, p.215

In the foregoing pages, al-Bāqir has put forward his views on the Imamate from the Qur'an and walāya or Imamate undoubtedly emerges as one of the duties imposed by God upon the believer; in fact according to al-Baqir it is the most important duty. He considers it to be the major pillar of Islam and the pivot around which all other pillars revolve.

The Imams are in al-Bāqir's view, the Protectors or Guardians of the believers and obedience to them is an obligatory duty. They are the people of the Message, to whom the Book, i.e. the Qur'an is given as an inheritance. Thus they are the interpretors of that Message and since they are the ones firmly rooted in knowledge it is they who should be asked about its interpretation. People envy the Imams because of God's favour upon them and because of the light and wisdom that has been bestowed upon them. Thus they are the ones who guide others and they are God's witnesses over His creatures. The Imams are pure and protected from sin and error and they are the light of God that walks amidst men so love for them was made incumbent upon the believers. On the day of Resurrection, all men will be called by their Imams. Thus, it is evident that al-Bāqir in propounding his theory of Imamate was not only maintaining its hereditary and divine character but also its necessity in this world (for the sake of true knowledge etc.)

(ii) Traditional basis of the Imamate

After demonstrating his view that the Imamate was a divine ordination on the basis of the Qur'ān, al-Baqir also laid stress on the traditions of the Prophet which, according to him were a further proof of the Imamate. The number of traditions quoted by al-Baqir are many but here an attempt will be made to lay stress on mainly those traditions accepted by all Muslims, Shi^{c}a as well as non-Shī^{c}a. This however should not lead us to beleve that the non-Shī^{c}ite scholars necessarily agree with the interpretations of these traditions. For them, as is known, the question of the Imamate, is not a principle issue as it is for the Shī^{c}a: "it is neither a part of rational sciences nor of fiqh", says al-Ghazālī.[1]

a) The ḥadīth or the tradition which the Prophet said at Ghadīr Khumm appears in al-Bāqir's view[2] to be one of the most important traditions in proving the Prophet's appointment of ^{c}Alī to the Imamate. It has been related with slightly different versions by the various Shī^{c}ite scholars.[3] The gist of the hadith is

---

1. al-Ghazālī, al-Iqtiṣād fī al-Iqtiṣād (Ankara,1962) p.234.

2. al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān Da^{c}ā'im I, pp.17 ff; al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī, I p.288-9.

3. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I pp. 294-5; al-Majlisī Bihār al-Anwār 37, pp.108 ff; al-Kirmānī, Maṣābīḥ pp. 112-13; Abū al-Fawāris, Aḥmad ibn Yac$_{qūb}$ al-Risāla fī al-Imama, ed. and trans. by S.N. Makerem pp. 28-29.

that on his return from the Farewell Pilgrimate, the Prophet stopped at Ghadīr Khumm[1] to make an announcement to the pilgrims who were then to disperse on their ways from this junction. He called for a congregational prayer and had a special pulpit erected.

After the prayer, the Prophet asked the people: Man awlā bikum i.e. who has the first claim over you? The people replied that God and His Messenger knew better. The Prophet then said: "Do I not have a prior claim upon you than you have upon yourselves according to what God, the Exalted has said, 'The Prophet has a prior claim upon the believers than theirselves?[2]" They replied, "Yes O Messenger of God". After repeating this three times and making God a witness to their agreement, the Prophet took the hand of ᶜAlī, of ᶜAlī, lifted it with his own hand and said, "man kuntu mawlāhu fa ᶜAlī-un mawlāhu" (He whose mawlā I am, ᶜAli is his mawlā). He then declared, "O God, help whomever helps him, oppose whomever opposes him, support whomever supports him, forsake whomever forsakes him and turn the light to whatever direction he turns." Hearing this, ᶜUmar ibn al-Khattāb said, "Congratulations to you, O ᶜAlī! You have become the

---

1. For details and sources see Veccia Vaglieri's art. on Ghadīr Khumm EI^2.

2. Qur'ān 33:6

mawlā of every believer, man and woman."[1]

The Sunnis[2] also confirm the above tradition andit has been mentioned by a great number of Sunnī traditionists.[3] However, this does not mean that the Sunni scholars admit that the Prophet invoked God to install ᶜAlī as Imam by pronouncing the invocation of Imamate upon him. Al-Baqillani,[4] for instance, argues that the phrase awlā bi al-mu'minin min anfusihim which he interprets as "in charge of the believers more than their ownselves" does not necessarily imply that ᶜAlī is also in charge of them too even though he said right after, "he whose mawlā I am, ᶜAlī is his mawlā". In his view the two words awlā and mawlā are by no means synonymous.

Another argument is that the word mawlā does not necessarily mean master and therefore it does not necessarily signify Imam whose obedience is incumbent

---

1. Abū al-Fawāris, Aḥmad ibn Yaᶜqūb al-Risāla fi al-Imama ed. and trans. by S.N. Makarem pp. 28.

2. Al-Khatib al-Tabrizī Mishkāt 3:342; Al-Dhahabī in fact says that the first part of the hadith i.e. Man kuntu is of the Mutawātir type (that which has been reported by numerous authorities) while the second part has a strong chain of transmitters. See Ibn Kathir, al-Bidāya wa al-Nihaya 5:24 (Cairo 1348-7 A.H.)

3. Ibn Ḥanbal Musnad 4:281, 370, 372; 5:347, 358. Al-Tirmidhī Ṣaḥīḥ 5:633; Ibn Maja Sunan 1:43; al-Nasā'ī Khaṣā'is p. 26; Ibn Kathir Bidāya 5:208-14.

4. Tamhid pp. 169 ff.

upon others.[1]

The word mawlā is derived from the verb wala (to be near...). Grammatically, it belongs to a class of nouns called Noun of Place and thus signifies either the place where the action of the verb is committed or the subject in which the state of being expressed by that verb has its existence. The word mawlā therefore signifies the place in which or the person in whom proximity exists. It can therefore mean master, patron, beloved, supporter, freed slave, companion, client, neighbour, confederate or relation. It is easy to see that the idea of proximity or nearness pervades these various meanings either in a physical or a moral sense. When a word can denote so many meanings, the context in which this word was used would perhaps help to clear its ambiguity. As the word mawlā was used by the Prophet soon after the phrase in which he used awlā (man awlā bikum) it is quite likely that he must have meant them to be synonymous.

Some[2] try and explain the circumstances which led

---

1. Ibid.

2. Ibn Kathīr, al-Bidāya, Vol. 5, pp.208-14. See also Ibn Ḥanbal, Musnad, Vol. 5, p.347 as well as al-Juwaynī, Irshād, pp.421-422 who asserts that the ḥadīth "Man kuntu mawlahu ...." is of the āḥād type. Refer also al-Baqillani Tamhid, pp. 169 ff.

the Prophet to say that what he did. In their view the problem was that some people were grumbling against ᶜAlī on account of the way in which he dealt with the distribution of the spoils in the expedition of al-Yaman, that had just taken place under ᶜAlī's leadership and from where he and others who had taken part in the expedition, came directly to Mecca to join the Prophet in the pilgrimage. So, they said, the Prophet was only trying to dispel these ill-feelings against ᶜAli.

The normal ways in which the word **mawlā** and its plural **mawālī** appear in the Qur'an are as follows:-

mawālī	4:33	heirs
	19:5	kinsfolk
mawālikum	33:5	clients
al-mawlā	22:13	Patron (Allah)
	44:41	Friend
mawlākum	3:150	Your Protector (Allah)
	8:40	Your Befriender - a Transendant Patron (Allah)
	22:78	Your Protecting Friend (Allah)
	57:15	Your Patron (Fire)
	66:2	Your Protector (Allah)
mawlāna	2:286	Our Protector (Allah)
	9:51	Our Protecting Friend (Allah)

mawlāhu	16:76 66:4	His owner His Protecting Friend (Allah)
mawlāhum	10:30	their Lord (Allah)

It is quite obvious that the word was used in pre-Islamic and early Islamic practice. It was used for both mawlā as a master, patron, friend as well as for the relationship between the mawlā and the mawālī (clients) - walā'. It is also used in the Constitution of Medina as the next of kin having the power of succession. In Islamic fiqh the walī is the person who gives away the girl in marriage as well as the person who demands blood wit.

Besides all the above ways in which the word mawlā was used before and after the coming of Islam what is more important is actually the context in which the word was used by the prophet in his sermon. As mentioned earlier on he had used the word mawlā soon after using the word awlā bi al-mu'mīnīn min anfusihim (in charge of the believers more than their own selves). Therefore it seems more likely that the word was used in the same context despite al-Bāqillānī's contrary observation.

To the Shīᶜa, according to al-Bāqir,[1] this pronouncement was not only indicative of the Prophets inclination towards ᶜAlī but was a clear and specific appointment which the people deliberately miscontrued.

b) Another tradition which is taken by al-Bāqir as evidence for the Imamate is the Prophet's saying to ᶜAlī:

> "You are to me what Aaron was to Moses except that there is no Prophet after me."[2]

This hadith is recognised by the Sunnis[3] as one of the

---

1. Daᶜā'im I, pp.17ff al-Bāqir does not give the details of the event but only says that the Prophet endorsed the walāya at Ghādir Khumm. This implies that the event was quite well known by then. The Qāḍī relates the details of the event without mentioning the name of the authority saying it is well-known and well attested by authorities. The oldest evidence for this event is the poetry of Hassan b. Thabit who composed and recited the verses spontaneously when people began congratulating ᶜAli. (See Amini, al-Ghadir Vol. 2 p. 32) However, Horowitz and Goldziher (see art. "Kumayt" in EI') think that those verses are spurious so in their view the earliest evidence of this tradition are Kumayt's verse (d. 126 A.H.)

2. Daᶜā'im 1:21,25 Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān does not say from whom this tradition is related but only says that it is well-known and well attested (on page 25 he says it has been related from the Prophet but does not again say from whom). It is interesting to note that in his version the Prophet said this at Ghadir Khumm. See also al-Kirmānī Maṣābīḥ pp. 115-16.

3. al-Bukhārī Ṣaḥīḥ 5:24; 6:3; Muslim Ṣaḥīḥ 7:20. Also see Ibn Sa'd Ṭabaqāt 3:1:14,15; Ibn Ḥanbal Musnad 1:182; Ibn Maja Sunan 1:43; al-Tirmidhī Ṣaḥīḥ 5:638-41; al-Nasa'i Khaṣā'iṣ, p. 4. Also see Ibn Hishām IV p. 163 and Ibn ᶜAbd Rabbih Iqd al-Farīd IV p. 311.

a sound (ṣaḥiḥ) tradition. Although admitting the authenticity of this tradition, the Sunnis however do not consider it to be an indication of ᶜAli's appointment to the Imamate. They maintain that the Prophet only said this hadith at one special occasion and that was when he set forth on his expedition to Tabuk (9 A.H.) and left ᶜAlī in Medina. Some people insinuated that the Prophet had left behind ᶜAlī because he disapproved of him and when ᶜAlī objected about it, the Prophet replied, "Are you not satisfied that you are to me what Aaron was to Moses except that there is no Prophet after me."

In view of the Sunnī scholars[1] this meant that the Prophet made ᶜAlī his deputy over Medina as Moses had made Aaron his deputy over the Israelites when Moses went to Mount Sinai. Aaron had three positions in relationship to Moses say the Sunnis.[2] In the first place he was his brother; secondly he was a prophet like Moses and finally he was his deputy when Moses left the Israelites to go to Mount Sinai. They say that since Aaron died before Moses, he could not be his

---

1. al-Bāqillānī, Tamhīd pp. 173-75, 228; al-Juwaynī Irshād p. 422. See for other arguments given by the Sunnis in S.N. Makarem's translation of Ibn Yaᶜqūb's al-Risāla fī al-Imāma (New York, 1977) pp. 73-75.

2. al-Bāqillānī Tamhīd pp.174-175

successor. As ᶜAlī was neither the Prophet's brother nor was he a prophet like Muḥammad, he could therefore, they argue, only be like Aaron by being Muḥammad's deputy when he left for the military expedition to Tabuk as was Aaron when Moses left for Mount Sinai.

The Ismaᶜili author, Ibn Yaᶜqūb[1] argues along the same lines in favour of ᶜAlī's being Muḥammad's successor. Agreeing with the Sunnis that the relationship of brotherhood2 and prophethood could not be applied to ᶜAlī's relationship with Muḥammad, so he argues that the only aspect left was that of ᶜAli being his successor. Whereas the Sunnis believed that Muḥammad appointed ᶜAli as his deputy over Medina only during Muhammad's expedition to Tabuk, Ibn Yaᶜqūb[3] says that there was no evidence of ᶜAlī being deposed on the Prophet's return. Moreover, they argue that if Muḥammad's saying merely meant that his appointment of ᶜAlī as his deputy was only for the time of his absence from Medina, then there was no reason for him to add, "yet after me there is no prophet."This addition clearly indicates that the Prophet meant

---

1. See S.N. Makarem's edition of Ibn Yaᶜqūb's al-Risāla fī al-Imāma, chapter four and his translation, pp. 28-33.

2. In this case Ibn Yaᶜqūb appears to be ignoring the Ukhūwwa between Muḥammad and ᶜAlī.

3. Ibid.

more than mere deputyship on a special occasion.

c) One of the basic traditions used by al-Bāqir in proving the necessity of a testament is "It is incumbent on every Muslim not to spend one night without having a written testament by his head."[1] This is further strengthened by the Qur'ānic verse 2:130-32:

> "Prescribed to you, when any of you is visited by death, and he leaves behind some goods, is to make testament in favour of his parents and kinsmen honourably - an obligation on the god-fearing. Then if any man changes it after hearing it, the sin shall rest upon those who change it; surely God is All-hearing, All-knowing."[2]

---

1. Da^{c}ā'im 2:343 where a version of it is mentioned by the Qadi. Another tradition says: "He who does not write his testament has a defect in his religion and in his reason." See Da^{c}ā'im 2:344. Also see Ibn Ya^{c}qūb's al-Risāla in S.N. Makarem's edition, pp. 32-33.

2. According to some Sunnī commentators these verse are totally abrogated by the so called "Verses of Inheritance" (Sūra 4:10-14). See Mustafa Zayd Al Naskh fī al-Qur'ān al-Karīm 2:385-93, apud S.N. Makarem while others believe they are not abrogated. Still others believe that the verses are abrogated only in relation to "the parents and kinsmen" who are supposed to inherit the property of the deceased. See al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr Vol. 3, pp. 384ff (Cairo edition) for details. There are still others and among them al-Hasan al-Basri who believe that these verses are not abrogated but they are rather elaborated specifically by the Verses of Inheritance. Since kinsmen are too remotely connected to be treated as natural inheritors, a testament is therefore necessary to allocate each one's share. Each of the natural inheritors' share is then specified in the "Verse of Inheritance." See Ibn Hajar al-^{c}Asqalānī, Bulugh al-Marām min Adillāt al-Aḥkām p. 273, apud S.N. Makarem op. cit.

This tradition is also mentioned and accepted by the Sunnis though with slight variations and is considered to be sound having been related by both al-Bukhārī and Muslim as well as other traditionists.[1]

d) Al-Bāqir stressed the necessity of the Imamate by another tradition "He who dies without an Imam shall die a death of ignorance."[2] This tradition is recognized and considered extremely reliable, with different versions, by both Sunnis and Shi^{c}as. Ibn Hanbal[3] relates as follows, "He who dies without an Imam shall die in ignorance." Muslim b. al-Hajjaj relates it as "He who forsakes obedience (to the Imam) shall meet God on the Day of Resurrection without any allegations, and he who dies without having had

---

1. al-Bukhārī, Ṣaḥīḥ, 4:2; Muslim Ṣaḥīḥ, 5:70. See also Malik b. Anas, al-Muwaṭṭä', p.539: Ibn Sa^{c}d Ṭabaqāt 4:1:108; Ibn Ḥanbal Musnad 2:10; Ibn Mājä Sunan 2:901; al-Nasā'ī Sunan 6:239; al-Tirmidhī Ṣaḥīḥ 3:295 and 4:432 and al-Khatib al-Tabrīzī in his Miskhāt 2:155.

2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I, p.397

من مات وليس عليه امام مات ميتة جاهلية .

3. Musnad 4:96

من مات بغير امام مات ميتة جاهلية

allegiance (to an Imam) shall die in ignorance."[1]

It is interesting to note the Ismāᶜīlī version of this tradition mentioned by Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān[2] and Ibn Yaᶜqūb[3] where the term "the Imam of the time" (Imam al-dahr, Imam al-ᶜasr or Imam al-zamān) is present. This implies that either the Ismaᶜili authors introduced this term in the hadith on account of their belief in the "ever living guide" or else the term was omitted or suppressed by others.

Emphasizing the necessity of the presence of an Imam, al-Baqir added that no efforts would avail anyone without guidance from the Imam of the time. In his view, such a person was similar to a strayed sheep who searches in vain for its shepherd and flock until eventually it is devoured by the wolf who takes advantage of this confusion.[4]

---

1. See al-Khatib al-Tabrīzī Miskhāt 2:319
من خلع يدا من طاعة ، لقى الله يوم القيامة ولاحجة له ،
ومن مات وليس في عنقه بيعة ، مات ميتة جاهلية .

2. Daᶜā'im, I, 31 cf. ibid 34, "He who dies without having known the Imam of his time (dahr) while alive (hayyan) dies in ignorance.
من مات لايعرف امام دهره حيا مات ميتة جاهلية .

3. al-Risāla fī al-Imāma in S.N.Makarem's edition p.3 (Arabic text) and p.22 for translation. Also see note 18 for details.
من مات ولم يعرف امام زمانه مات ميتة جاهلية
"He who dies without knowing the Imam of this time dies in ignorance."

4. al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī pp.183-4.

Al-Bāqir is reported to have told one of his followers that even when any of them travelled only a few miles out to a strange place they needed a guide, then what about the path to the heaven of which they were far more ignorant than those of the earth.[1]

The fact that the Sunni traditionists relate some of these traditions and consider them to be genuine does not mean that they agree with the Shī^{c}a concept of the Imamate, be it Ithna ^{c}Asharī or Ismā^{c}īlī. In the Sunni view, the Imam's function is pre-eminently political although he may perform religious functions but these do not tend to lend him any sanctity.[2] In their view, as the Imam is only a protector and an executor of the Sharī^{c}a, he does not need to be divinely appointed; but is installed by Ijmā^{c} (consensus.)[3]

However, according to the Shī^{c}a the choice of an Imam does not fall within the community's sphere and

---

1. al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī pp.183-4.

2. See for details, Sir Thomas Arnold The Caliphate p.17.

3. See al-Baqillānī Tamhīd pp.185-86; al-Ghazālī Faḍāiḥ, pp.143-144.

the therefore it is not their concern to decide who the Imam should be. This is seen by them to follow from al-Bāqir's view[1] that the walāya or the Imamate is one of the pillars of Islam rather the most important one. In his view "Islam is built on seven pillars: walāya (Love and Allegiance to Imam), ṭahāra (Purification), ṣalāt (Prayer), zakāt (Almsgiving), ṣawm (Fasting), ḥajj (Pilgrimage) and jihād (Strife in God's Way). Walāya is the best among them, because through it and through the one to whom allegiance should be paid, the knowledge of the other pillars is reached."[2] Being thus a matter of fundamental belief, the Consensus (ijmāᶜ) cannot be applied just as it cannot be applied in matters concerning monothesim and in the prophethood of Muhammad and in his being God's Messenger.[3]

---

1. Daᶜā'im I, p.2

2. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'īm I, p.2; al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I, p.290 has a tradition from al-Bāqir which says God made five things incumbent upon his worshippers: they adopted four and left aside one and that is the walāya; the other four being ṣalāt, zakāt, ḥajj and ṣawm.

3. See Ibn Yaᶜqūb's Risāla, p.27 where he refutes the notion that the Imam should be chosen and installed by the Consensus of the Community.

The choice of an Imam according to al-Bāqir[1] was long decided when God granted Ibrāhīm this favour and conferred the Imamate to him and his progeny (who did not go astray). In fact this favour was given to Ibrahim after God had initially accepted him first as a worshipper, second as a Prophet, third as a Messenger, fourth as a friend and finally as an Imam over the people. When this distinction was given to Ibrāhīm he could not help asking God whether this favour would remain in his progeny whereupon God answered that those who go astray shall not receive it. Thus the choice of an Imam is not a matter to be decided by the people but comes from above. It is infact a favour that God grants, it cannot be acquired.

iii) Theology of the Imamate

In enunciating the theory or the doctrine of the Imamate, al-Bāqir postulated certain principles pre-requisite to it.

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p. 175

ان الله اتخذ ابراهيم عبدا قبل أن يتخذه نبيا واتخذه نبيا قبل أن يتخذه رسولا واتخذه رسولا قبل أن يتخذه خليلا واتخذه خليلا قبل أن يتخذه اماما فلما جمع له هذه الاشياء - وقبض يده - قال له : يا ابراهيم اني جاعلك للناس اماما فمن عظمها في عين ابراهيم قال : يارب ومن ذريتي ، قال لا ينال عهدي الظالمين .

a) Naṣṣ

Al-Bāqir categorically maintained that the Imam had to be divinely appointed[1] and that, that appointment had to necessarily be clear and precise, i.e. by naṣṣ (explicit designation) instead of what some groups believed. He had to be quite specific about his theory lest there were loopholes in it for those who were already claiming the Imamate during his time[2] as well as for those who intended to claim it in future.

In order that his theory had sufficient credence, al-Bāqir had to begin with the appointment of ᶜAlī who had to be designated expressly by Prophet Muḥammad. This in his view was done at several occasions culminating in the event of Ghadīr Khumm.[3]

---

1. See his views in "the Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate," and the "Traditional basis of the Imamate.

2. The claims of the Kaysānīya and its various branches; the claims of Zayd and his followers as well as the claims of other Alids and also those of the extremists. See Chapter Three for more details.

3. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I p. 18 and al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I, p.289. See for more details the section earlier on 'Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate' and al-Mufīd K. al-Irshād (trans. Howard), pp. 29 ff.

Al-Bāqir is reported to have said to Abū Hamza al-Thumālī that:

أوحى الله تعالى اليه أن يامحمد قد قضيت نبوتك واستكملت ايامك، فاجعل العلم الذي عندك والايمان والاسم الاكبر وميراث العلم وآثار علم النبوة في أهل بيتك عند علي بن ابي طالب فاني لن اقطع العلم والايمان والاسم الاكبر وميراث العلم وآثار علم النبوة من العقب من ذريتك كما لم أقطعها من ذريات الانبياء.[1]

In brief the above passage relates that the Prophet, before his death was commanded by God to bequeath to ᶜAlī his knowledge, his faith and the Great Name (Ism al-aᶜzam) that he had as well as the legacy of knowledge and prophethood, so that the transmission of the divine heritage would be followed through the prophet's progeny. This implies that this naṣṣ which constituted of special knowledge was meant exclusively for the offspring of the Prophet and thus was

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I, p. 293

hereditary. The hereditary character of the nass was the crucial point in the doctrine of the Imamate that al-Bāqir was putting forward. He was therefore trying to bring some order into the muddled, confused and chaotic ideas of the Imamate rampant at the time.[1] For until then anyone and everyone was claiming nass from someone or the other.[2] So the idea of hereditary nass was a kind of restriction for all those who thought could claim the nass and have the licence for leadership.[3]

It was in this manner then i.e. by al-nass that al-Bāqir appointed his son, Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq. On a number of occasions, al-Bāqir let his followers know that Jaᶜfar was the best of the mankind and that he was the Qā'im āl-Muḥammad (one in charge of the Prophet's family).[4] When his days were drawing near he asked for

---

1. See chapter three - section on rivals of al-Bāqir.
2. ibid.
3. Although it must be added that this did not deter some who were bent on claiming this leadership e.g. some of the ghulāt like Bayan claimed nass from al-Bāqir himself. See section on Al-Bāqir and the Ghulāt in Ch.3.
4. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I pp. 306 ff.

witnesses to be brought to him. So four people from the Quraysh came, among whom was Nafi^{c} the freedman of ^{c}AbdAllāh b. ^{c}Umar (d. c. 117 A.H.)[1] Al-Bāqir is then reported to have asked them to write down what Prophet Ya^{c}qūb had entrusted to his son, and thus made a nass-on his son Ja^{c}far al-Ṣādiq.[2]

If the above report is authentic then this aspect of calling witnesses from outside was something quite different, for, al-Bāqir's own appointment, according to traditions in al-Kulaynī[3] was done in the presence of his brothers when he was entrusted with a casket containing secret religious scrolls and the weapons of the Prophet. Apparently both al-Baqir and

---

1. This gives us another insight to al-Bāqir's death-date. According to Mufīd's Irshād Nāfī^{c} died in 119^A.H.

2. يابني أن الله اصطفى لكم الدين فلا تموتن الا وانتم مسلمون
واوصى محمد بن علي الى جعفر بن محمد وامره أن يكفنه في برده الذي كان يصلي فيه الجمعه ، وأن يعممه بعمامته ، وأن يربع قبره ، ويرفعه اصابع وأن يحل من ازاره عند دفنه .

3. al-Kāfī I:305 ff. It is believed that when Zayn al-^{c}Ābidīn died, al-Bāqir's brothers demanded their share of the contents of the casket but he refused, saying that it was given to him as his exclusive inheritence.

later his son al-Ṣādiq insisted upon the importance of these weapons which were the same to the Muslims, they said, as the Tabūt (Ark of Covenant) had been to the Israelites.[1]

Again, according to traditions found in al-Kulaynī, al-Bāqir maintained that his father Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn was designated by Ḥusayn[2] who in turn was appointed by Ḥasan[3] whom ᶜAlī had designated.[4]

---

1. al-Kāfī I:238 ff. The Ḥasanids who claimed to have them but Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq emphatically denied that ᶜAbdAllah al-Maḥḍ and his son Nafs al-Zakīya had, as they asserted the famous sword of the Prophet, Dhū al-Fiqār. See Abū al-Faraj al Isfahānī Maqātil 188; al-Ṭabarī Annales ... III 247. Other versions in al-Ṭabarī state that they came into the possession of the ᶜAbbāsids as well.

2. There are conflicting reports from al-Baqir as to when the naṣṣ was made on Imam Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn - whether the battlefield or before setting forth for Karbalā. See al-Kāfī, I pp.303

3. al-Kāfī I,pp. 300 ff.

4. See al-Kulayni al-Kāfī I pp. 298-9. However, later Ismāᶜīlī sources suggest that after ᶜAlī, the Imam was Ḥusayn not Ḥasan as the Twelvers and other Shīᶜite sects believe. To the Nizārī Ismāᶜīlīs al-Ḥasan was no more than a Trustee (Mustawdaᶜ) Imam. See Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Firās, Ash-Shāfīya (The Healer) ed. and transl. by S.N. Makarem (Beirut, 1966) pp. 146-7. Also see

   (i) ᶜAlī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Walid Risālāt al-Īḍāḥ p. 139.
   (ii) Ibn Zahra, al-ᶜUṣūl wal aḥkam p. 120
   (iii) al-Khattāb ibn Ḥasan, Ghayāt al-Mawālid p. 35

apud S.N. Makarem's transl. of ash-Shāfīya.

b) <u>ᶜIlm</u>

Besides the hereditary character of the <u>naṣṣ</u> what was out of the ordinary about al-Baqir's theory was that this <u>naṣṣ</u> embodied in itself exclusively authorative knowledge <u>(ᶜIlm)</u> for the recepient of that <u>naṣṣ</u>. This <u>ᶜIlm</u> too had to be traced back to ᶜAlī of whom the Prophet had said "I am the city of knowledge and ᶜAlī its gate".[1] This tradition has been acknowledged by the Sunnīs[2] as well although they do not necessarily agree with the Shī'ite interpretation. According to al-Baqir's traditions in al-Kulayni[3], God

---

1. See Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān, <u>Ta'wīl al-Daᶜā'im</u> ed. by Muḥammad Ḥasan al-ᶜAẓamī (Cairo n.d.) p.86. Also see <u>Kitāb al-Kashf</u> attributed to Jaᶜfar b. Mansur al-Yaman ed. by Mustafa Ghālib (Beirut, 1984) p.118

2. al-Tirmidhī <u>Ṣaḥīḥ</u> 5:301; al-Khaṭib al-Tabrīzī <u>Mishkat</u> 3:244; al-Khawārizmī <u>Manāqib ᶜAlī</u> p.40 al-Tirmidhī considers this tradition as being <u>gharīb munkar</u> i.e resting on only one authority who is unreliable while al-Bukhārī rejects its authenticity completely. However, Ibn Hajar al Asqalānī considers it authentic (see al Khatīb al-Tabrīzī <u>Mishkāt</u> 3:315) <u>apud</u> S.N Makarem's translation of Ibn Yaᶜqub's <u>al-Risāla fi al-Imama</u>. p. 76 note 62.

3. <u>al-Kafi</u> I p. 437

(i) ان الله عز وجل نصب عليا علما بينه وبين خلقه فمن عرفه كان مؤمنا ومن انكره كان كافرا ومن جهله كان ضالا ومن نصب معه شيئا كان مشركا .

(ii) ان عليا باب فتحه الله فمن دخله كان مؤمنا ومن خرج منه كان كافرا ....

has appointed ᶜAlī as a flag or signpost between Himself and His creation and thus whoever acknowledges ᶜAlī is a believer and he who rejects him is an un believer. Again he adds that "ᶜAlī is a door that God has opened; he who enters it is a believer and he who leaves it is an unbeliever."

Al-Bāqir maintained that knowledge which descended upon Adam is never taken away but is to be inherited. Alī was the learned one of this community and a learned one from among us never perishes before leaving behind him someone from his family who inherits this knowledge from him or what God wills.[1] The Imams, according to al-Bāqir, are the guards of Allah (khuzzān Allāh) on the heavans and the earth, not over gold and silver but over his knowledge.[2]

ᶜAlī had inherited the knowledge of all the awṣīyā' of the Prophets that had gone before him[3] as the

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I 222
2. Ibid p. 192-3
3. Ibid p. 224

Prophet who had been endowed with the sum of knowledge available to all the preceeding prophets had imparted it to ᶜAlī[1] who in turn bequeathed it to his descendants. Every Imam, before death passes it on to his successor.[2] This includes both the ẓāhir (exoteric) and the bāṭin (esoteric) sides of the Qur'ān and in fact, in al-Baqir's view no one except the awṣīyā' can claim to possess the whole Qur'ān.[3] Describing some aspects of the knowledge that is given to them and that is unfolded to them, al-Bāqir said that it included the interpretion of the Qur'an and its legal judgments as well as the knowledge of the changing times and its misfortunes.[4]

The Imams, too, al-Bāqir said, know the Greatest Name of God (Ism Allāh al - Aᶜẓam) which is in seventy-three versions (ḥarfan-literally letters). Al-Bāqir added that Aṣif (Aṣaph) who had known only one version of it could reach the throne of Bilqis by pronouncing

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 263
2. al-Kāfī I p. 222
3. Ibid p. 228
4. Ibid p. 229

that version[1] while the Imams knew seventy two versions of that and the remaining one is with Allah himself. This refers exclusively to hidden knowledge.

Thus this doctrine of Imamate put forward by al-Bāqir was based primarily on knowledge, not on political rule although they were entitled to the latter as well. If the Imams wished to know anything they would know it he said.[2]

However in order to avoid confusion, al-Bāqir did make a distinction between the offices of a **rasūl** (Messenger), a **nabī** (Prophet) and a **muḥaddath** (One who is spoken to i.e. the Imam) and the way they came to have their knowledge. Thus according to al-Bāqir, a messenger (**rasūl**) is one who is inspired externally by the mediation of the archangel Jibrāil. He may see the archangel and hear his words either in a dream or when awake. A prophet (**nabī**) either sees visions without

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p. 230. Aṣif (Aṣaph) said that the earth between him and the throne of Bilqis sank, so that he could reach it with his hand, then the earth returned to its previous state, quicker than an eye could blink.

2. **al-Kāfī** I p. 257

hearing them speak or hears voices without seeing anyone. A muḥaddath does not see any supernatural being either in dreams or in a wakeful state but hears voices.[1] The Imams, al-Bāqir said, were the muḥaddathun mentioned in the Qur'ān.[2]

c) Nūr

Besides the ᶜIlm, the clear or manifest delegation of authority also appears to involve the transmission of Nūr for as we have seen earlier,[3] the Imams are, according to al-Bāqir, the light of God (Nūr Allāh). When asked to comment on the following Qur'ānic verse 44:8

> "And believe in Allah and His Messenger and the Nūr (Light) that We have brought down"

Al-Baqir said that the Nūr (light) was indeed the Nūr

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p. 176
2. Ibid p. 270-1
3. See section on 'Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate'

of the Imams from the Prophet's family; they i.e. the Imams were the light that God had brought down and they (in fact) were the light of God (Nūr Allāh) in the heavans and on earth.[1] This spiritual light which transmigrates from generation to generation is actually the symbol of that eternal knowledge (ᶜIlm)[2] which forms part of the Prophet Muhammad's testament (waṣīya) to ᶜAlī and thereafter to the following Imams. According to this doctrine, the Light became incarnate in ᶜAlī only at the last moment of the Prophet's life.[3]

However, another tradition of al-Bāqir[4] tends to reveal the concept of Nūr Muḥammad whereby he is reported to have said to Jābir al-Juᶜfī:

---

1. See al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p.194

2. See Uri Rubin's article "Prophets and Progenitors in Early Shīᶜa Tradition" JSAI I (1979) p. 44

3. See al-Kāfī I: 274 where traditions from al-Bāqir's son, Jaᶜfar al-Sādiq reveal that the following Imam became aware of all the knowledge that the previous Imam had only at the last moment of the latter's life. See also p.239 where a tradition relates that before his death, the Prophet called for ᶜAlī and communicated to him a thousand chapters of knowledge, each one opening into a thousand more.

4. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p.442

> "O Jābir, the first beings that God created were Muḥammad and his family, the rightly guided ones and the guides; they were the phantoms of light before God" Jabir asked, 'And what were the phantoms?' Al-Bāqir said, "Shadows of light, luminous bodies without spirits; they were strengthened by the Holy Spirit (Rūḥ al-Quds), through which Muḥammad and his family worshipped God. For that reason he created them forebearing, learned, endowed with filial piety, and pure; they worship God through prayer, fasting, prostrating themselves, enumerating His names, and pronouncing: God is Great."

According to the above concept ᶜAlī's share of light was transferred on his birth.[1] Traditions maintain that Muḥammad and ᶜAlī were created from the same (prophetic) light which wandered through the loins of their common ancestors, till it was split in the loins of ᶜAbd al-Muṭṭalib, the common grandfather of both Muḥammad and ᶜAlī. After that it was divided into two parts, Muhammād's light being placed in the loins of his father ᶜAbdAllāh and ᶜAlī's in those of Abū Ṭālib[2].

---

1. ibid. See also al-Masᶜūdī Ithbāt al-Waṣīya 4th edition, (Najaf, 1945) pp. 90ff.

2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī p. 442

From ᶜAlī this light was transmitted to the following Imams, thus serving as the basis of their divine nature.[1] This hereditary doctrine of Nūr Muḥammad which, as part of the ancestral sperm had come to him not from Muhammad but from his father, Abū Ṭālib appears to be different from Nūr Allāh (Divine Light) which is regarded as a part of the divine spirit which transmigrated from Muḥammad to ᶜAlī at the former's death. This light, too is regarded as having been transmitted through a universal line of carriers and is said to have reached Muḥammad from Adam through the Judaeo-Christian prophets who apparently had no relation to Muḥammad.[2]

---

1. U. Rubin, "Prophets and Progenitors ....." p. 43; also see W.A. Rice, "ᶜAlī in Shīᶜa Tradition" MW, 4 (1914), 29-30 as well as U. Rubin's art. "Pre-existence and Light" IOS, 5 (1975) pp. 62 ff.

2. See for details U. Rubin's art. "Prophets and Progenitors in the Early Shīᶜa Tradition" JSAI I (1979) pp.41-65. The light is said to have reached Muḥammad from Ismāᶜīl (Ishmael) not through his Arab progenitors - the posterity of Ishmael - but through the Judaeo-Christian prophets of Banū Israel to whom the light was transferred from Ishmael via his brother, Issac. Rubin however does not seem to verify his statement. He only adds in the footnote that this view is parallel to the Ismāᶜīlī doctrine about the cyclical manifestation of the ᶜaql through the nāṭiqs but the examination of the exact relationship between the two views remains beyond the scope of his paper.

In Rajkowski's view[1] the above tradition on Light and other such similar ones tend to indicate that Manichean ideas were being introduced in the Shīᶜite doctrine by extremists and semi-extremists; he, in fact places Jābir al-Juᶜfī among them. There may perhaps be some truth in the views that he has expressed but one must not forget that the doctrine of light in its embryonic form is embodied in the Qur'ān itself.[2] Muḥammad himself is described in the Qur'ān as Sirāj Munīr.

It thus appears that the doctrine of Nūr Allāh according to which the Prophet and the Imams possess a divine heritage and a sanctified light which they have inherited from the preceeding prophets is different from the doctrine of Nūr Muḥammad which regards the prophetic light of the Prophet and the Imams as coming from Prophet Muḥammad's Arab ancestors.

---

1. See his unpub. thesis Early Shīᶜ'ism in Iraq (Univ. of London, 1955)

2. See 7:157; 4:174; 4:45; 57:28; 24:35; 44:8 9:32; 76:26; and 61:8. See also Kumayt's Hāshimīyāt in the Horovitz edition poem 3 v. 39-40 (Leiden 1904) p. 84.

It is possible that the Imam is recepient of not only Nūr Allāh which as an independent spiritual entity is entrusted to the next Imam by nass only at the last moment of the previous Imam's death but also of Nūr Muḥammad, which as part of the ancestral sperm is confined to the genealogical line of the Imam's progenitors. The latter i.e. Nūr Muḥammad makes the Imam who is sāmit (silent) until such time as when he receives the former i.e. (Nūr Allāh) and he becomes Nāṭiq (speaking). In other words Nūr Muḥammad gives the recepient potentiality of the Imamate but the actuality appears only when he receives Nūr Allāh by means of nass from the previous Imam.

What we have here are two symbols: one is the symbol of prophecy (Nūr Allāh) which is shared by both Prophets and Imams. On the other hand, there is the symbol of succession (Nūr Muḥammad) which is also related to the divine and which is there as part and parcel of the line from Adam to Muḥammad and through to the Imams. This of course is a light that may be latent, i.e. did not shine in the person of ᶜAbd al-Muṭṭalib and Hāshim but yet it distinguished them from the others around them. Whether they were aware of it or not, they were from a special family.

The fact that the two images of light are used here does not mean that they are conflicting. In other words Nūr Allāh embraces all men chosen by God but Nūr Muḥammad is limited to the direct line of Adam through Muḥammad down to the line of the Ahl al-Bayt.

d) ʿIṣma

The Nūr and the ʿIlm which the Imam came to have possession of by the naṣṣ, rendered the Imam maʿṣum i.e. protected from error and sim. As mentioned earlier on[1], al-Bāqir based this concept on his interpretation of the Qur'anic verse, 33:33.

The question to be asked is whether the concept of infallibility or impeccability (ʿiṣma) applies only to the religious matters or does it cover the actions accruing from human nature? Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān[2] does not appear to specify and nor does al-Kirmānī.[3] He adds

---

1. See section on "Qur'ānic basis of the Imamate".

2. K. al-Walāya in Daʿā'im and K. al-himma.

3. Rahat al-ʿAql, p.217, although he discusses the ʿiṣma of the Imam in his analyses of al-arkān al-arbaʿa (the four elements) where the soul is the "learner" and the bāb, ḥujja and dāʿī are "teachers". The Imam is above all these, see ibid pp. 201-218, 250 apud, P.J. Vatikiotis who has described this in his book The Fāṭimid Theory of State (Lahore, 1957) pp. 43 ff.

that "the souls of Prophets and legatees and the Imams are not similar to the souls of these lesser ḥudūd (grades) inferior to them, are not impeccable and are amenable (tastaḥīl) to good and evil."[1] However the author of al-majālis al-mustanṣirīya claims that the Imam is maᶜṣūm but that the ᶜiṣma applies only to divine and religious matters, not to those of the human realm.[2]

The legal and political implications of this above doctrine are clear, i.e. that the Imam has the absolute

---

1. ibid, p.45.

2. p. 110 using Sura II: 33, 35-38. Until recently there was a controversy regarding the author of this collection of thirty-five discourses in al-Mustansirīya, for the book states it is written by al-dāᶜī Thiqāt al-Imam ᶜAlam al-Islam. This situation appears to have arisen as a result of a continuous change of dāᶜīs between the years 451 A.H. and 454 A.H. Moreover, the position of Imam al-Mustansirbillah was getting precarious as the minister was fast gaining strength. When (in his despair) he assigned the offices of wazir, qāḍī al-quḍāt and dāᶜī al-duᶜāt to one person, the titles of thiqat al-Imam and ᶜalam al-islam became common addresses of these officials. Hence the difficulty of knowing which thiqat al-Imam or ᶜalam al-islam is which. Ivanow thinks the work belongs to al-Mu'ayyad fi al-din but Vatikiotis is not sure of that. See for more details, pp. 201ff. in his Fatimid Theory of State. S.M. Stern however has proved that the author is Abū l-Qāsim ᶜAbd al-Hakīm b. Wahb b. ᶜAbd al-Rahmān al-Malījī, chief qādi from 7 Dhu' l-Qaᶜda 450-11 Rajab 452; Studies in Early Ismaᶜilism pp.239-40.

power over the community and since he is appointed by God and is infallible, the community who are not infallible can neither appoint him nor elect him.[1] Thus there is no room for the principle of ijmāᶜ (consensus).

e) Ḥujja

Another aspect of the Imamate which has come down to us from al-Bāqir's traditions is the concept of ḥujja (guarantor). In his view, ever since the time of Adam's death there has always been an Imam to guide (mankind) towards Allah who is His guarantor[2] (ḥujja) over His worshippers. The world, al-Bāqir maintains, cannot exist (even) for a moment without the Imam who is the ḥujja of God.[3] If the Imam were to be taken

---

1. ᶜAlī b. Muhammad al-Walid (b.522 d.612 A.H.) Taj al-ᶜAqā'id wa Maᶜdan al-Fawā'id ed. by ᶜĀrif Tāmir (Beirut, 1967) p.76.

2. Ḥujja in my view is best translated as guarantor. See Madelung's art. on Imāma in EI² who has translated it as both, proof or guarantor and from whom I have adopted the word. The word 'Proof' has been in use for a long time and still can be used but to me it does not appear to reveal the task which the ḥujja has to undertake. On the other hand the word 'guarantor' gives the meaning that he is someone who has undertaken some kind of responsibility from someone for somebody else.

3. al-Kāfī I, p.179. See also Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I p.20-21.

away from the earth (even) for an hour, the earth would heave with all its inhabitants just as the sea heaves with its people.[1]

"We (The Imams) are", al-Bāqir said, "the ḥujja (guarantor) of God and His Gate. We are the tongue as well as the face of God; we are eyes of God (guarding) His creation and we are the responsible guardians (wulāt al-amr) of God on earth."[2] Al-Bāqir further added that God is worshipped through the Imams and it is through them that God is known and declared as One.[3]

The above mentioned qualities which the Imam possesses makes him al-afḍal al-Nās i.e. the best among mankind. It was in this manner thus that al-Bāqir tried to establish his posistion as the Imam declaring himself to be the representative of God upon earth and the divinely-inspired interpreter of His words. His success in this aspect can be gauged

---

1. ibid
2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī, I. p.145
3. ibid.

from two angles - firstly from the number of followers he had been able to gather and attract[1] and secondly from the success and immense popularity of his son, al-Ṣādiq who followed and elaborated his views.

---

1. See chapter six - section on Shī^{c}ite associates.

CHAPTER FIVE

SOME THEOLOGICAL VIEWS OF AL-BĀQIR

The theological discussions which were aggravated by the fitna[1] had grown even more serious at the time when al-Bāqir lived. People began to question the validity of the Imamate[2] and the "status of the believer" which the Imam must possess. This led to questions about īmān and islām and whether aᶜmāl (actions/deeds) were a necessary part of īmān as well as whether they were a requirement for a person to be called a muslim. These questions gave rise to the problem of man's responsibility or lack of responsibility and then, as parallel considerations arose questions about the nature of the Qur'an (created or uncreated) and the emphasis laid upon the divine attribute of the Word.

---

1. The fitna resulting from ᶜUthmān's murder.
2. Imamate in the general sense of the word; not in the Shīᶜa sense.

The above issues brought into its wake the more general problem of the divine attributes, their existence and their connection with the divine essence, and its unity. In the course of time many more issues were raised and added; however at this early period, the essential themes which were later to constitute the religious science of kalām had already arisen.[1] In the following pages, an attempt will be made to present al-Baqir's views on some of the issues that were being seriously debated and broadly discussed during his time.

i) Īmān :

One of the essential questions that was being discussed at this early period and upon which the various schools were divided was Īmān.[2] A number of many related questions were raised such as the distinction or non-distinction between Īmān and islām, and of their connection. Another issue connected with this was whether there were degrees of faith.

---

1. See L. Gardet's art. on "ᶜIlm al-Kalām" in EI^2

2. A more detailed discussion about this will be found in EI^2 art. "Īmān" where the views of the various schools of thought are mentioned.

Al-Bāqir basing his views on the Qur'ānic verse 49:14:

> "The Bedouins say : 'we believe'. Say : you do not believe; rather say, 'we have accepted Islam (aslamnā). Faith has not yet entered your heart."

made a clear distinction between īmān and islām. He said that īmān included islām but islām did not encompass īmān.[1] Similar views of al-Baqir are to be found in the Daᶜā'im al-Islām,[2] where he symbolizes islām and imān by drawing two circles on his palm and describing the outer one as islām and the inner one as īmān because that he said, was the realization of the heart. Therefore in his view a mu'min is automatically a muslim but a muslim is not necessarily a mu'min.[3]

Al-Bāqir elaborated the above aspect when asked by someone whether he who had entered islām had entered

---

1. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī II, p.26.
2. al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I, p.16.
3. Daᶜā'im I, pp.16-17.

Īmān? He replied : "No" but added that the person had come out of kufr (unbelief) and was being associated with Īmān (qad uḍīfū ilā al-Īmān). Taking the example of the Kaᶜba and the Masjid al-ḥarām, al-Bāqir then asked the questioner that if he had seen a person in the mosque, would he testify that he had seen him in the Kaᶜba? The questioner replied : "He could not say that." Al-Bāqir then asked that if he had seen a person in the Kaᶜba would he be able to ascertain that he had been in the mosque? The questioner said: "Yes." So al-Bāqir said that the same was the case with Īmān and islām.[1]

Further details about the differences between Īmān and islām can be seen from yet another question put to al-Bāqir. Asked if he who witnessed that there is no divinity but God, and Muḥammad is the Messenger of God was a believer? Al-Bāqir replied : "then what about the duties imposed by God?"[2] As far as the duties were concerned, there were seven of them according to al-Bāqir as mentioned earlier.[3] In his view, walāya

---

1. al-Kāfī II, pp.26-27.
2. al-Kāfī II, p.26
3. See the previous chapter on Imamate.

was the foremost of the duties imposed upon the believers around which all other duties revolved.[1]

Thus for al-Bāqir, true īmān is directly related to the walāya of the Imams; rather īmān emerges from believing in Imam. Thus his formula of īmān as distinct from islām was formed by belief in the Prophets, Messengers and Imams of God with complete obedience to the commands of the Imam of the time.[2]

The above views of al-Baqir tend to show that īmān is both words (qawl) and deeds/actions (aᶜmal).[3] According to the definition given by al-Bāqir's son īmān is qawl bi al-lisān (words with the tongue),

---

1. al-Daᶜā'im I, p.17.

2. Daᶜā'im I, pp.15-17 where some of the traditions are from ᶜAli. One tradition says islām is iqrār (confession) and īmān is iqrār and maᶜrifa (knowlege consisting of acknowledgement of God, Prophet and Imams).

3. See al-Kulayni al-Kāfī II, p.26 where the word fiᶜl is used instead of aᶜmal.

inner conviction (taṣdiq bi al-janān) and works/ actions in accordance with the pillars imposed by God (wa ᶜamal bi al-arkān).[1] On the other hand, Abū Ḥanīfa, a younger contemporary of al-Bāqir held different views. According to article 1 of the Waṣīya ascribed to Abī Ḥanīfa:

> "Faith is confession (iqrār) by the tongue, internal conviction (taṣdiq bi al-janān) and knowledge of the heart (wa maᶜrifa bi al-qalb)".

It is clear that there is no mention of actions in the above definition. But according to the Khārijites, the Qadarites and the Muᶜtazilites, "works or actions" are an integral part of faith, even as faith itself.[2] The Murji'a, on the other hand regard "works" as irrelevant to faith (īmān) which implied that faith had

---

1. Daᶜā'im I, p.1. His tradition in al-Kāfī I, p.70 says that Hazrat ᶜAlī reported from the Prophet that there can be no 'words' except by 'works' and no 'words or works' except by 'intention' and no 'intention' (niyya) except by adhering to the sunna correctly (iṣaba al-sunna).

2. EI^2 art. "Īmān". Here it is not meant to go into the details of what status the Khārijites and Muᶜtazilites accord to the 'grave sinner'.

a degree of stability and was not impaired by sin.[1]

Al-Baqir vehemently opposed these Murji'ite views, for according to Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī he is reported to have said that "the Murji'a had changed the Sunna of Allāh, both externally and internally" and that "they were the Jews of this community whose enmity towards us is more severe than that of the Christians and the Jews."[2] In the political field such an attitude meant that the Murji'a were ready to accept the temporal rulers even when their behaviour was sinful in some respects and therefore they were not to be opposed by other muslims. Since they believed in the 'postponement' of the decision about the grave sinner, they had to face the problem of defining <u>īmān</u> so that it corresponded to that which made a man a member of the community as a whole. This is what made them exclude 'works' (<u>aᶜmāl</u>) from faith (<u>īmān</u>). Abū Ḥanīfa and his followers appear to be taking the same line of thought; infact al-Ashᶜarī in his <u>Maqalāt al-Islamiyīn</u>[3] considers the Ḥanāfīya as a sect of the Murji'a.

---

1. Wensink <u>Muslim Creed</u> 38, 45, Cf. also his article on "Murji'a in EI[1]. See also al-Ṣādiq's views on Murji'a in the <u>Daᶜā'im</u>, p.1

2. <u>K. al-Zīna</u> in al-Sāmmarrā'ī's edition p. 262

3. p.202.

According to al-Bāqir there are different grades among the Mu'min[1]. Explaining this further, al-Baqir's son, al-Sadiq says that some believers are better than others, some pray more than others some are more clear-sighted or discerning than others.[2]

Among the qualities which a mu'min ought to have according to al-Bāqir are:

> "Reliance (tawakhul) on God, Leaving the decision of affairs (tafwīḍ) to God, Contentment (riḍa) with the decree (qaḍā) of God, and Submission (taslīm) to the Command or Will of God."[3]

Whilst on a journey, the Prophet once came across a group of people who told him that they were believers whereupon the Prophet asked them what was the proof of their Īmān and they gave the last three of the four qualities mentioned above, said al-Bāqir.[4]

---

1. al-Kāfī II, p.45
2. ibid.
3. al-Kāfī II, p.47
4. Ibid, p.53.

In al-Bāqir's view Īmān was built on four pillars:

(i) Patience (ṣabr)
(ii) Certainty (yaqīn)
(iii) Justice (ᶜadl) and
(iv) Struggle or War (jihād)

It is clear that in al-Bāqir's views a person's virtues were directly linked to his Īmān. In one of his traditions al-Bāqir maintains that

> "The believer who is most perfect in Īmān is the one who has the best character."[1]

Talking of more specific virtues, he talks of one especially that is ṣabr (patience or patient endurance) which he says is like the head to the body.[2] He who has no ṣabr has no Īmān and describing the perfect ṣabr he said it was that in which there is no

---

1. al-Kāfī II, p.99
2. ibid, p.87

complaint to the people.[1]

An aspect that arises from the question of degrees of faith is regarding Īmān ᶜan Ilm i.e. faith based on knowledge (religious knowledge). Al-Bāqir places immense emphasis on acquiring ᶜilm for there are numerous traditions reported from him exhorting his followers to do so.[2]

However, in al-Bāqir's view acquiring knowledge is not an end in itself but a means to an end. He says it is not enough to acquire knowledge but it is important to act according to the knowledge acquired[3] and even to teach others what one has learnt.[4] This leads us to the question of ᶜilm and aᶜmal i.e. by means of ᶜilm, aᶜmal can be improved and if aᶜmal are improved, then Īmān can increase and become stronger. Thus, according to al-Bāqir, ᶜilm, aᶜmal and Īmān are all inter related.

---

1. ibid, p.93

2. See al-KulaynI's al-KāfI I, especially the Kitab fadl al-ᶜilm pp. 30 ff.

3. al-KāfI I, p.45

4. ibid, p.35, 41.

ii) Taqīya (precautionary dissimulation)

In al-Bāqir's view, the question of taqīya[1] appears directly related to that of ᶜilm and īmān mentioned above. A man visiting him from Basra told him that al-Hasan al-Basri claimed that those who concealed knowledge would offend people in Hell with their wind. Al-Bāqir told him that if that were the case then the believer from the Pharoah's family would have been destroyed. He then went on to add that:

> "Knowledge has remained hidden ever since God sent Noah, so let al-Hasan wander every where (lit. right and left) for by God, no knowledge will be found except in here[2]

The above incident suggest that the question whether knowledge could be concealed or not i.e. whether it was permissible to operate taqīya or not was

---

1. The word taqīya is derived from the verb waqā which means to keep from, or guard someone or something against someone or something else. See EI[1] art. "taqīya" for a general account.

2. al-Kāfī I, p.51 Cf. a tradition from al-Bāqir in the Daᶜā'im I p.17 where al-Ḥasan deliberately conceals the 'message' (of walāya) revealed to the Prophet from a certain questioner, thus contradicting his own views on now to conceal knowledge.

being discussed during the time of al-Bāqir. The views expressed by al-Bāqir indicate the emphasis he laid on concealing knowledge i.e. operating taqīya with regard to knowledge. He once asked someone what would he say if he (i.e. al-Bāqir) told a person who loved them to use some precautionary disguise or dissimulation (taqīya). The man replied: 'You know best', then al-Bāqir said: 'If he would adopt it (i.e. taqīya) it would be better for him and he would be greatly rewarded.' According to a variant version he said: 'If he adopted it, he would be rewarded and if he neglected it, he had sinned, by God.'[1]

The first version of the tradition suggests that it was preferable for someone to employ taqīya but the second version implies that it is a duty which if not obeyed was a sin. According to his son al-Ṣādiq, al-Bāqir also said that "concealment is my religious practice as well as that of my ancestors. Whosoever does not practice taqīya has no real faith. He who divulges our secret (amr) is like the one who rejects it."[2] Thus, here al-Bāqir is already putting forward

---

1. al-Kāfī I, p.65.

2. al-Daᶜā'im I, p.75. See also Jaᶜfar b. Manṣūr al-Yaman's Asrār al-Nuṭaqā' in Ivanow's Rise of the Fatimids (excerpts) p. 92.

the doctrine of taqīya as a principle or as a necessary part of īmān.

Once Zurāra b. A^{c}yan came with a problem to al-Bāqir to which he replied. Then came another person who inquired about the same problem Zurāra had asked. Al-Bāqir gave him a different answer. After that a third person came along to ask the same question. He too was given a different answer to the ones given before. When the two questioners had left Zurāra asked al-Bāqir as to why he had given different answers to the two Shī^{c}īs of Iraq? Al-Bāqir replied:

ان هذا خير لنا وابقى لنا ولكم ، ولو اجتمعتم على امر واحد لصدقكم الناس علينا ولكان أقل لبقائنا وبقائكم .

"That is better for us and that will remain with us and with you, for if you all were to agree upon one thing then people would turn against us which would mean (the chances of) your survival and our survival would decrease"[1]

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 65.

The use of taqīya appears extremely essential to al-Bāqir's teaching for he insisted on ᶜIlm being divided into ẓāhir (exoteric) and bāṭin (esoteric). In this connection al-Bāqir's reply to Jābir b. Yazīd al-Juᶜfī is significant when the latter inquired why he gave different answers to the same Qur'anic problem at different times:[1]

يا جابر إن للقرآن بطنا وللبطن
بطنا ، وله ظهر وللظهر ظهر.
يا جابر ليس شيء أبعد من
عقول الرجال من تفسير
القرآن، ان الآية يكون أولها
في شيء وآخرها في شيء
وهو كلام متصل منصرف
على وجوه .

In the above answer, al-Bāqir tells Jābir that the Qur'ān has an inner meaning (baṭn) and the inner meaning has still another inner meaning and that the Qur'ān has an outer meaning (ẓahr) which also has

---

1. al-Barqī K. al-Mahāsin II p. 300

another outer meaning. Then, al-Bāqir adds that there was nothing further from men's intellect than the tafsīr of Qur'an for the beginning of an āyat can be about something while the end of it may be about something else; they are words which are connected (muttaṣil) in meaning yet changing (munṣarif) in various aspects.

The question of taqīya in political terms was closely linked with the discussion on amr bi al-maᶜrūf wa l-nahy ᶜan al-munkar i.e. 'enjoining good and probiting evil'. The question raised in this connection was how far it is a duty to see that other people do what is right and refrain from wrong. Some muslims believed that this operation of 'enjoining good and prohibiting evil' should be done by force if necessary. The Muᶜtazila adopted this view believing that if there was a reasonable chance of opposing then the opponent must be opposed even if that meant someone had to be killed in the process.

Al-Baqīr's views did not tally with the views of those who were using this doctrine at this particular time to advocate revolution, at least for the time being, for as is known, he did not approve of armed revolt and infact had dissuaded his half-brother, Zayd

b. ᶜAlī from adopting that course. This must be under taqīya for according to his tradition[1] he did believe in undertaking the sword but that at the time when he lived the time was not yet ripe enough.

Another area where al-Bāqir appears to have used taqīya was on the question of the two shaykhs i.e. Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar. According to Ibn Saᶜd[2], he is reported to have called them leaders of right guidance and said that ᶜAlī did not want to contravene their practice.[3] Yet his conviction that the Prophet had expressly designated ᶜAlī as his successor must have meant to him that their succession was an invalid usurpation. Some Kufans believed that al-Bāqir only concealed his real opinion

---

1. al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Sharh f.71 ff; Manāqib f.303 ff

> "Anyone from among the Prophet's family who undertakes the sword before our mahdī's time is like the young bird who tries to fly before its wings are strong enough; as a result it would only jump once or twice before being caught by the children who would then toy with it."

2. Ibn Saᶜd Ṭabaqāt V p. 231

3. This is of course contrary to reports in al-Tabarī I p.2778 where ᶜAlī refuses to follow the sira i.e. the practice of the two Caliphs.

by using the principle of taqīya.[1] So concerned was al-Bāqir about the situation, that the doctrine which was for the protection of the Shīᶜa was made a principle in order to ensure their safety.

However taqīya was never unfamiliar to Islam, even its early phases. The following Qur'ānic verse excuses taqīya under conditions of severe constraint:

> "Whoever disbelieves in God, after he has believed - excepting him who has been compelled, and his heart is still at rest in his belief - but whosoever's breast is expanded in unbelief, upon them shall rest anger from God, and there awaits them a mighty chastisement."[2]

This verse is unanimously believed to refer to ᶜAmmār b. Yāsar, the famous companion of the Prophet, who was compelled under heavy torture by the unvelievers from Quraysh to renounce Islam. When he was accused by some

---

1. See Kashshī Rijāl pp. 205ff where traditions referring to the poet Kumayt quote al-Bāqir as violently disavowing Abū Bakr and Umar. But Kumayt himself never vilified the first two caliphs openly according to his Hāshimiyāt (p. 155) at least. Perhaps Kumayt was using taqīya as Hāshimiyāt was a poem for the public.

2. Qur'an 16:106. Another such verse is 3:28.

Muslims of disbelief, the Prophet said, "No! ᶜAmmār is full of faith from head to foot. Faith has been mixed with his flesh and blood." When ᶜAmmār in fact came to the Prophet crying because of his forced renunciation, he was told, "Why should you (cry)? If they repeat (their torture), repeat what you have told them."[1]

iii) Qaḍā' wa Qadar

During the Umayyad period there was much discussion on this question of qaḍā' wa qadar which was related to the previously discussed topic of īmān. Some people argued that, since God determined everything they could not help committing sins[2] This in a way was a justification of moral complacency and was not purely academic, but was linked with political concerns. For such an altitude could mean that the Umayyad regime was ordained by God and was therefore not to be opposed. In fact there is adequate evidence to suggest that the Umayyads defended and justified

---

1. Al-Baydāwī, Anwār 1:528; Ibn Kathir, Tafsīr al-Qur'ān al-ᶜAẓīm 2:586. Although the Sunnis allowed such taqiya, they preferred that the believer abide by the declaration of his faith.

2. W.M. Watts, Islamic Philosophy and Theology (Edinburgh, 1979) p. 31.

their rule on the basis of such predestinarian ideas.[1]

These theological arguments provoked a reaction from those who were accustomed to think of man as a responsible agent. Those who held this doctrine of freewill came to be known somewhat illogically as Qadarīya.[2] One group believed that ḥasanāt (noble actions) and khayr (goodness) are from God while wickedness and base actions are from men.

According to traditions in al-Kulaynī,[3] al-Bāqir quoted a revelation of God who said "I have created both, good and evil; thus blessed were those from whose hands I perform good and woe upon those through whose

---

1. 'The earth is God's; He has entrusted it to his Khalīfa; He who is head in it will not be overcome.' Al-Farazdaq Dīwān ed. (Beirut, 1960) I, p. 24.

   'God has garlanded you with the Khilāfa and guidance, for what God decrees (qaḍā') there is no change'. Jarīr, Dīwān (Beirut, 1960) p. 380.

2. The name would have been more appropriate for those who maintained God's omnipotence and His qadar but it came to be applied to those who believed in human responsibility and freewill. See EI^2 arts "Qadariya" and "al-Qaḍā wa al-Qadar". Also see W.M. Watt, Freewill and Predestination .... (London, 1948) pp. 48ff. It is to be noted however, that at the time, men who agreed on certain doctrines did not necessarily associate it with certain principles. This varied from time to time as well as from person to person.

3. al-Kāfī I p. 154

hands I performed evil, and woe also to those who said: how is this and how is that?" According to tradition al-Bāqir said:

> "Allah the Almighty and Exalted was there (when) nothing was there except Him. He always knew what will be, and His knowledge of a thing before it comes into existence is like His knowledge of it after it comes into being."[1]

However, elsewhere al-Bāqir maintains that:

> "God is more merciful than forcing His creatures to sin and then punishing them and God is more powerful than desiring a matter/thing that cannot be done."[2]

When asked whether there was a third position in between jabr and qadr, al-Bāqir replied that there was and that it was wider than the distance between the sky and the earth.[3] When his son was asked about jabr and qadr, he replied:

> "There is no jabr and no qadr but there is a position in between the two."

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 107
2. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p. 159
   ان الله ارحم بخلقه من أن يجبر خلقه على الذنوب ، ثم يعذبهم عليهم والله اعز من أن يريد امرا فلا يكون .
3. al-Kāfī I p. 159

He then added that its truth is not known by anyone anyone except the ᶜalīm or by him whom the ᶜalīm has taught.[1] Al-Bāqir's views here depict an intermediate position supporting neither determination nor freewill. However, the first tradition of al-Baqir is unambiguously deterministic.

iv) The Unity of God

There were three main areas of dispute which came under the topic of 'unity of God': a) the nature of the Qur'ān, (b) the problem of God's attributes and (c) the denial of any resemblance between God and his creation.

(a) As far as the first problem is concerned, the point at issue was whether the Qur'ān, which all agreed to be the speech of God (Kalām Allāh) was created speech or uncreated speech. The view that it was uncreated perhaps originated as a result of many scholars claiming that events occurred by the qadar or

---

1. See for details regarding al-Ṣādiq's views Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāṣim b. Ibrāhīm (Berlin, 1965) p. 58 n. 94. Also see Kulayni Kāfī pp. 159-160.

determination of God.[1] The argument from some Muslims was partly that since certain historical events are mentioned in the Qur'ān, these must have been known eternally by God and therefore pre-determined.[2] The reaction to this doctrine of uncreatedness i.e. that the Qur'ān had appeared in time was evaded by taking the Qur'an as an expression of God's knowledge.[3] Thus some defenders of human freedom insisted that the Qur'an was created,[4] supporting their views by quoting such Qur'anic verses as:

"We have made it an Arabic Qur'ān;[5]

---

1. For details see Watt, Formative Period p. 179 and for an even fuller discussion see his 'Early discussions about the Qur'an' Muslim World xl (1950), 27-40, 96-105.

   Perhaps there was also a connection between this problem of uncreated Qur'ān with that of the 2nd person of the trinity in Christian theology.

2. It must be pointed out however that those who believed in human freewill generally did not deny the eternal fore knowledge of God.

3. Watt op. cit.

4. It must be remembered that there were many predestinarians also who held that Qur'ān was created.

5. Qur'ān 43:2

They asserted that the word 'made' (ja^{c}alnā) meant the same as 'created'.

As far as al-Bāqir's views on the question are concerned they are not clearly discernible from his traditions in the Da^{c}ā'im or al-Kāfī except for one tradition which implies that the Qur'an was created.[1] The tradition runs as follows:

ان الله خلو من خلقه ، وخلقه خلو منه
وكل ماوقع عليه اسم شيء ماخلا
الله تعالى فهو مخلوق
والله خالق كل شيء .

"God is seperate from His creation and His creation is seperate from Him; everything which is given a name is a thing which is created except God and He is the Creator of everything."

Since the Qur'ān is the name of the Book it would imply that it is created. However, according to al-Kashshī,[2] al-Bāqir is reported to have said that the Qur'an is neither created nor uncreated; it is the Word of the Creator. This is supported by views attributed

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 82.
2. Rijāl p. 305

to al-Bāqir's father[1] as well as his son.[2] Thus al-Baqir seems to be proposing here a midway position between the two opposing arguments.

(b) The question of God's attributes is directly related to the doctrine of the createdness or uncreatedness of the Qur'ān, for the speech of God is an attribute of God. Therefore the dispute was also carried out about the nature of the divine attritubes.

The Qur'ān describes God as Willing, Knowing, Decreeing etc. According to al-Asha^{c}rī[3], most of the Khārijites as well as many Murji'ites and the Mu^{c}tazila held that 'God is knowing, powerful and living through Himself (bi-nafsi-hi) not by knowledge, power and life,' and when they permit the phrase 'God has knowledge to be used, it is only in the sense that He is knowing.

---

1. Abū Nu^{c}aym Hilyāt al Awliyā' III p. 188

2. W.M. Patton, Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal and the Miḥna (Leiden, 1837) p. 139 where Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal quotes this statement: al-Qur'ān kalām Allāh, lā Khāliq wa lā makhlūq in defense of his own position. See also Madelung, art. 'Imamism and Mu'tazilite theology' in Le Shi^{c}isme Imamate (Paris, 1970) p.18.

3. Maqalāt 164.

When al-Bāqir was asked about the relationship of divine attributes to God, he is said to have replied: "there is nothing like God and nothing resembles Him. He has forever been the Knowing, the Hearing and the Seeing."[1] It is also reported that when al-Bāqir was asked if it was proper to worship the Compassionate, the Merciful One, the Unique, the Absolute, he said: "Anyone who worships 'the names' without the One named is committing shirk (polytheism), is an infidel and a denier and in fact does not worship anything. "Rather" al-Baqir added, "worship God, the One, the Unique, the Absolute who is called by these names without the names (themselves) for the names are only attributes by which He characterizes Himself."[2]

For al-Bāqir, the attributes appear to be eternal but only as adjectives. They help believers to understand something about God but they are not to be confused with God.

(c) When al-Bāqir was asked about the Unity of God by

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 86.
2. Ibid p. 87.

ᶜAbd al-Rahmān b. Abī Najrān whether it was proper for him to imagine (God as) something, al-Bāqir replied: Yes, but not as something reasonable or limited. He added: "God is completely different to whatever you imagine; he neither resembles anything nor can imagination (ever) attain Him, for how could imagination even attain him while He is totally different to what is reasonable and (also) different from what can be pictured in imagination. He can be imagined only as a thing beyond reasoning and beyond (any) limitation."[1]

A Khārijite went up to al-Bāqir and asked him "what thing do you worship?", he replied: "Allāh, the High". So he was asked whether he had seen Allāh and al-Bāqir gave a long reply that "Although eyes do not see Him yet the heart can see Him with the reality of faith.[2] He is not known by analogy nor is He felt by the senses nor can He be likened human beings. He is described by signs or the verses (of the Qur'ān) and

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 82

2. This answer in response to a theological question seems to have mystical connotations and is used by later Sufis.

known by symbols; He is not unjust in His judgements, that (verily) is Allah, there is no God but He."[1]

When al-Bāqir was asked by the transmitter of the tradition, Abū Hāshim al-Jaᶜfarī to comment on the Qur'ānic verse "Although vision or eyesight could not see God yet God could see (or discern the power of) vision", al-Bāqir said:

> "the imagination of the heart is more accurate than the vision of the eyes; you may imagine Sind, Hind and other countries that you have never visited and seen with your eyes; yet the imagination of the heart does not attain Him, then how could the vision of eyes?"[2]

Al-Bāqir is also reported to have said "talk about the creation of Allah but do not discuss about Allah Himself as the conversation will only create confusion for the speaker"[3]. When thinking of God, al-Bāqir is reported to have warned people to be careful.

---

1. al-Kāfī I p. 97. The Khārijite went away saying: "God knows where to place His message"

2. al-Kāfī I p. 99.

3. al-Kāfī I p. 92

Thus God, in al-Bāqir's view does not resemble anything and is beyond imagination and beyond any limitation. He cannot be seen with the naked eye but can be felt by the inner reality of faith; and can be described by signs and symbols.

The primitive nature of the theological ideas discussed above would indicate the early stage of the discussion in which al-Bāqir was taking part and the probable authenticity of his views which are at a very simple level compared with the theological discussions that were to come later. The sources for these views are mainly traditions attributed to al-Baqir in al-Kāfī and al-Daᶜā'im. While both these collections of traditions are much later than al-Bāqir, it is interesting to note that al-Bāqir is never attributed with theological language which is identifiably later than his own, nor with theological views that are clearly different from those of his time. Thus it would seem fair to assume that these traditions represent views held by al-Bāqir.

CHAPTER SIX

AL-BĀQIR IN TRADITIONIST CIRCLES

(i) Non-Shī^{c}ite circle:

This section intends to look at al-Bāqir's picture outside his immediate Shī^{c}a. Scholars[1] suggest that his reputation as a traditionist was wider than his Shī^{c}a. He is unanimously esteemed in non-Shī^{c}ite circles as one of the most trustworthy authorities on the traditions of the Prophet bearing the quality of thiqa. This was the highest degree of trust bestowed by muslim scholars only to those people who were reliable, trustworthy and accurate in transmitting traditions. Al-Bāqir and his son, al-Ṣādiq are included in Sunnī isnāds in works such as Mālik's Muwaṭṭā'[2], Ṭabarī's Ta'rīkh[3] and Tafsīr

---

1. Ibn Hajar al Asqalānī (d.852), Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb, Vol.9-10 (Hyderabad, India, 1326 A.H.) pp.350 ff. Ibn Sa^{c}d Ṭabāqat al-Kubra, vol.5 (Beirut n.d.) p.324, vol.5 (Leiden, 1965) pp.235 ff, Al-Safadī, Salaḥ al-dīn Khalīl b. Aybak (d.764 A.H.) Al-Wafī bi al Wafayāt, vol.4 Wiesbaden (Damascus, 1959) pp.102-3. Abu Nu^{c}aym al-Isfahānī Hilyāt al-Awliyā' Vol.3. (Cairo, 1933) pp.180 ff.

2. Mālik b. Anas al-Muwaṭṭā' Vol. I & II edited and commented by Muḥammad Fuwād ^{c}Abd al-Bāqī (Algeria, 1951). See traditions No.40, 44, 107, 126, 127, 131 and 158 in Vol. I and tradition no.17 in Vol. II.

3. Al-Ṭabarī Ta'rīkh al-Rusūl wa al-Mulūk (Cairo 1961) Vol.2 pp.410,446 and 485; Vol.3. pp.73 and 212. Vol.5 pp 153, 347, 349, 351, 389, and 448; Vol. 6. p. 61; Vol.7 pp 181, 208 and 569.

Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad[1], Shafi^{c}i's Risāla[2] and many such other works.

Al-Bāqir's position among his contemporaries appears to be such that many other scholars felt inferior to him and even the most eminent ones regarded him with awe and reverence on account of his outstanding knowledge. ^{c}AbdAllāh b.^{c}Atā' al-Makkī is reported to have said that he had never seen the scholars feel so small in the presence of anyone as he had seen them feel besides Abū Ja^{c}far Muḥammad b. ^{c}Alī b. al-Ḥusayn (al-Bāqir)[3]. He added, even al-Hākam b. Utayba (d. 113/731), a famous traditionist, despite his age and eminence, behaved before Abū Ja^{c}far as though he were a pupil in front of a teacher.[4]

Another famous non-Shi^{c}īte scholar, Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir is reported to have said[5] that he had not

---

1. Ibn Ḥanbal Musnad 14 vols. (Cairo, 1950) edited by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir. Vol. I tradition no.576; Vol. II traditions no.597, 601, 605 and 688; Vol. III traditions no.1833 and 2081; Vol. IV traditions no. 2153 and 2284.

2. Al-Shafi^{c}ī Al Risāla fi uṣūl al Fiqh 2nd edition by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir (Cairo, 1979). See traditions no. 1245 and 1182.

3. It must be admitted however, that such praise is not rare in the biographies of traditionists.

4. Abū Nu^{c}aym Hilyat al Awlīyā' III p.186.

5. Ibn Hajar Tahdhīb Vol. 10 pp.350 ff.

seen anyone surpassing ᶜAlī b. al-Husayn until he encountered his son Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī, i.e. al-Bāqir. The encounter itself is not given in Ibn Hajar's Tahdhib. But according to the Shīᶜite sources[1], once it so happened that he had been out to one of the suburbs in Medina on an extremely hot day, where he came across al-Bāqir, a well built man, leaning on two of his servant boys. Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir thought to himself: "Here is a venerable leader of the Quraysh out at this time, seeking wordly advantage in these circumstances. Let me warn him." So he approached al-Bāqir and greeted him. Al-Bāqir returned his greetings with anger, sweat pouring down him. Muḥammad al-Munkadir said:

> May God reform you, O! venerable leader of the Quraysh, out at this time seeking wordly advantage in these circumstances. (What would you do) if death were to come upon you while you were in this condition?"

Al-Bāqir made the two servant boys let go of his hands and held himself up. Then he said:

> "By God, if death came upon me while I was in this condition, it would come upon me while I am (fulfilling) an act of obedience to God, by which I make myself withdraw from you and from the (rest of the) people. I would only fear death if it came upon me while I was performing an act of disobedience against God."

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān's Sharḥ f.68-69 and Manāqib f. 301-2.

Then Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir replied: "May God have mercy on you, I had intended to warn you but you have infact warned me."

Despite all the credit given to al-Bāqir in non-Shīᶜite literature, traditions reported by al-Bāqir do not feature very prominently in the surviving traditional literature.[1] There are however reports on his authority, though few in most of the major works. But, the few traditions in the extant Sunnī literature do not tend to support his authority as an eminent traditionist as described by the biographical dictionaries. It must be admitted however that not all the traditionists described as prominent have numerous traditions reported in their names. Yet one cannot but help analysing the situation in al-Bāqir's case as he is generally acclaimed as Bāqir al-ᶜIlm "One who splits open knowledge."[2]

It is interesting to note that al-Zuhrī (d.124), who narrated traditions from al-Bāqir and studied under

---

1. i.e. the six canonical works of Bukhārī, Muslim and others.

2. See Ibn Ḥajar Tahdhīb, Vol 9-10 pp. 350 ff. which gives a list of those people who said that he was called al-Bāqir al-ᶜIlm. This includes the name of Zubayr b. Bakkār (d. 256 A.H.), a scholar of historical traditions at Medina who later became a Qaḍī at Mecca.

al-Bāqir's father, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn[1] features extremely well in the surviving Sunnī literatures, while al-Bāqir at whose feet even Mālik (97-179) and Abū Ḥanifa (80-150 A.H.) sat, has been set aside with only a few traditions to his credit. Obviously, one has to take into account the fact that the surviving literature is not in anyway comprehensive. Further, the text (matn) of the traditions may have been available to the reporters through many asānid (plural of isnād - chain of transmission). Therefore it is quite probable that one isnād may have been inserted to the exclusion of others. Yet the possibility always remains whether this was purely coincidence or a deliberate matter of preference; a process of conscious "picking and choosing." The latter possibility cannot be totally ignored for even the most objective writer or reported would have his own attitudes and tendencies. A brief look at the background of the period will elucidate this point clearly.

---

1. See ᶜAbd al-Rahman al-Hāfiz, The Life of al-Zuhrī and his scholarship in Hadīth and Sunna (unpub. Ph. D. thesis, Edinburgh 1977) pp.268-270; Al-Zuhrī has infact reported that he had most of his sittings in the company of Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn, Abu'l Hajjaj Yusuf al-Mizzī (d. 743 A.H.) Tahdhib al-Kamal, VII under the heading "Alī b. al-Ḥusayn" apud. al-Hafiz's op. cit. Also see Ibn Saᶜd V, p.158 who mentions how it was only Zayn al-Ābidīn who could free Zuhrī from a sadness that had struck him once. Refer Ibn Ḥanbal's Musnad III traditions No. 1882 and 1883.

Ḥadith literature led a troubled existence during its formative period. One of the things that had significant effects on its development was the political changes in the early history of Islam. Therefore those who occupied themselves in collecting and narrating traditions soon found out that they had to reckon with severe state censorship. Al-Ṭabarī[1], for example states that Muᶜāwiya I had ordered public condemnation of ᶜAlī and his parties, and the glories of the family of ᶜUthmān be extolled. In such circumstances then, except during ᶜUmar II's period, and later when the Umayyad power was sapped, it was hardly possible for anyone to sympathize publicly with the house of ᶜAlī.

However, it must be mentioned that the extant traditional literature does not date as far back as the Umayyad Caliphate although some of the traditions have been handed down since then. One of the earliest extant works is the Muwaṭṭā whose writer Mālik b.

---

1. Al-Ṭabarī II, p.112; al-Zuhrī has definitely stated that these princes have made us write ḥadīth.

Anas,[1] although born during that period, lived the last forty-five years of his life, the years of his literary activity, under the aegis of the ᶜAbbāsids. An exception to this is the Musnad of Aḥmad b. Ḥanbal (d.241 A.H.) which has not been expurgated so as to entirely please the ᶜAbbāsids. It includes traditions of obviously Syrian origin that are favourable to the Umayyads as well as a great many exceedingly detailed records that support the claim of the Shīᶜites.

It is then safe to assume that such political upheaval may have been an influential factor in determining what traditions were to be circulated and in whose names they were to be reported.

Despite the fact that not many traditions in al-Bāqir's name are reported in the extant Sunnī literature yet Ibn Hajar (d.852 A.H.) gives a long list of names from whom al-Bāqir has reported traditions and to whom he has in turn transmitted them. According to him the following names are of those from whom al-Bāqir

---

1. Malik b.Anas had given his oath of allegiance with others to the ᶜAbbāsid al-Manṣūr under compulsion. He was publicly flogged for venturing to make the decision that an oath given under compulsion was not binding. His interest in collecting traditions was for the sake of their bearing on jurisprudence and his Muwaṭṭā' is not one of the six canonical collections.

has reported traditions:-

1. His father ᶜAlī, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn (d.c. 94 A.H.)
2. His two grandfathers, Ḥasan (d.49 A.H.) and Ḥusayn (d.61 A.H.)
3. His father's grandfather, ᶜAlī b. Abī Ṭālib (d. 41 A.H.) - mursal.
4. His father's uncle, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya (d. 81 A.H.)
5. His grandfather's cousin, ᶜAbdAllāh b. Jaᶜfar (d. 80 A.H.)
6. Samura b. Jundub (d. 59 A.H.)
7. ᶜAbdAllah b. ᶜAbbās (d.c. 68 A.H.)
8. ᶜAbdAllah b. ᶜUmar (d.c. 73-4 A.H.)
9. Abū Hurayra (d. 57-8 A.H.)
10. ᶜĀ'isha bint. Abī Bakr (d.c. 58 A.H.)
11. Umm Salama.
12. Abū Saᶜīd al-Khudrī.
13. Jābir b. ᶜAbdAllāh al-Anṣārī (d.c. 78 A.H.)
14. Anas b. Mālik (d. 91-3 A.H.)
15. Ibrāhīm b. Saᶜd b. Abī Waqqās.
16. Saᶜīd b. al-Musayyib (d. 94 A.H.)
17. UbaydAllāh b. Abī Rāfiᶜ.
18. Ḥarmala, mawla of Usāma.
19. ᶜAtā' b. Yasār, mawla of Maymuna (d.103 of 94 A.H.)[1]

---

1. See Ibn Saᶜd V, p.129.

20. Yazīd b. Hurmuz.[1]

21. Abū Murra mawla of ᶜAqil b. Abī Ṭālib (no date of death is given in Ibn Saᶜd, vol.5, p.131 but he goes on to say he was an old man narrating traditions from people like Abū Hurayra and ᶜUthmān).

These above names include the Ṣaḥābis or the Aṣḥāb who were contemporary with Muḥammad as for instance, Samura b. Jundub, Jābir b. ᶜAbdAllah, Abū Hurayra, ᶜĀ'isha and others. However, if one were to look at their dates of death and compare them with al-Bāqir's birthdate one soon realizes that Abū Hurayra and ᶜĀ'isha had died before al-Bāqir was born. In the case of Samura, and his paternal grandfather, al-Ḥusayn, he was a mere toddler at the time of their death while his maternal grandfather, al-Ḥasan died long before he was born. It is thus that Ibn Hajar[2] mentions a report saying that only the traditions of al-Bāqir from Ibn ᶜAbbās,[3] Jābir b. ᶜAbdAllah and AbdAllah b. Jaᶜfar b. Abī Ṭālib are marfuᶜ, i.e. traceable directly to the Prophet while what he has narrated from other

---

1. Ibid

2. See Tahdhīb, vol. 11-12, p.369 where it is believed he died during ᶜUmar II's reign.

3. See Ibn Ḥanbal Musnad IV tradition no. 2153.

Companions (although the list includes some tābiᶜūn i.e the first generation after the Prophet as well as tābiᶜū al-tābiᶜūn i.e. the second generation after the Prophet) are all mursal i.e. traditions that are handed down by a tabiᶜī about the Prophet when an intermediary link is missing.

The few traditions of al-Bāqir found in some of the Sunni sources reveal that besides narrating traditions from his own immediate family, the only outsider on whose authority al-Bāqir reports the traditions is Jābir b. ᶜAbdAllāh al-Ansārī.[1] He is the only one among the companions who lived until al-Bāqir was almost twenty-one. The other aspect that comes forth in these few traditions is al-Bāqir's own standing as a traditionist for all the three sources include isnāds that stop at al-Bāqir.

In the Muwaṭṭā'[2] out of eight traditions the first two traditions stop at al-Bāqir as follows: Malik..... Jaᶜfar..... his father (al-Bāqir), while the other four[3] add that al-Bāqir heard it from Jābir b.

---

1. See Ibn Hazm, al-Ihkām fī uṣūl al-Aḥkām, Vol. 5 p. 96. Al-Shāfiᶜī Al-Risāla (Cairo, 1979) tradition no. 1245, Mālik Muwaṭṭā I tradition nos. 107, 126, 127 and 131.

2. Muwaṭṭā' I traditions nos. 40 and 44.

3. Muwaṭṭā' I traditions nos. 107, 126, 127 and 131.

ᶜAbdAllāh and the last two[1] maintain that he heard it from ᶜAlī b. Abī Tālib. This clearly indicates the authority of al-Bāqir as a traditionist; infact it gives us an idea about the families' standing as sources of authority. It must be mentioned, however, that Mālik was not a traditionist and his interest in collecting traditions lay mainly for their impact upon jurisprudence.

The two traditions found in al-Shāfīᶜī's Risāla[2] also show that one stops at al-Bāqir while the other, is reported from Jābir. In the Musnad of Ibn Ḥanbal too, there are some isnāds stopping at al-Bāqir[3] while in some traditions he is reporting from his father ᶜAlī Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn.[4]

The fact that the Sunni sources include in their works traditions having isnāds that stop at al-Bāqir suggests that al-Bāqir is quoted as a direct authority. This means that either his traditions are regarded as

---

1. Muwaṭṭā' I tradition No. 158 and Muwaṭṭā' II tradition No. 17.

2. Tradition no. 1245 and 1182.

3. Musnad III tradition no. 2081; Musnad I tradition no. 576.

4. Tradition nos. 601 and 688 in Musnad II.

marfu^{c} i.e. traceable to the Prophet[1] or that al-Bāqir was speaking on his own authority as an Imam. The latter aspect is not altogether impossible keeping in mind his own views on the Imamate but whether the Sunnī traditionists mentioned him in their works in his capacity as an Imam is debatable. For, as is known[2] when the Medinans began accusing al-Bāqir of transmitting hadiths on the authority of the Prophet, whom he had never seen, the name of Jābir b. ^{c}AbdAllāh was inserted between him and that of the Prophet to make the traditions more acceptable.[3] This does not of course mean that al-Bāqir did not report any traditions from Jābir but what it does suggest is that although al-Bāqir may have been saying things in his capacity as

---

1. لو انّا حدثنا برأينا ضللنا كما ضلّ من كان قبلنا
ولكنّا حدثنا ببيّنة من ربّنا بيّنه لِنبيّه
فبيّنها لنا.

"If we said anything according to our own individual opinion, we would go astray just as those before us have done. But we give evidence from our Lord who explained it to his Prophet who in turn explained us". See al-Saffār, Baṣa'ir al-Dar^{c}ajāt II p.299. apud. Al-Sayyid Murtaḍa al Askarī, Muqaddimat Mirāt al-^{c}Uqūl II (Tehran, 1398 A.H.) pp.55. See also other traditions of al-Bāqir on pp. 54-57 in the same work.

2. See M.J. Kister art. Djābir b. ^{c}AbdAllah in Suppl. of EI p. 231.

3. E. Kohlberg, "An unusual Shī^{c}ī isnād" in Israel Oriental Studies V (1975), 142-9. Also see Kister's art. op. cit.

an Imam from the Shī^{c}ite point of view, the non-Shī^{c}ite transmitters could not accept his authority as an Imam and therefore the formal act of inserting Jābir's name had to be employed in some traditions.

Transmitters of al-Bāqir:

Ibn Ḥajar[1] gives a long list of those people who narrated traditions from al-Bāqir. Many of them attained great fame and formed their own study circles in turn. In this way al-Bāqir's traditions reached posterity not only through his own progeny but also through these various scholars. They are as follows:-

1. His son, Ja^{c}far al-Ṣādiq (d. 148 A.H.)
2. Abū Ishāq al-Sabī^{c}ī, ^{c}Amr b. ^{c}AbdAllāh (d.128 A.H.)
3. Al-A^{c}rāj, (d. after 140 A.H.)
4. Al-Zuhrī, Muḥammad b. Muslim Ibn Shihāb (d.124 A.H)
5. ^{c}Amr b. Dīnar (d.c. 126 A.H.)
6. Abū Jahḍam, Musa b. Sālim.
7. Al-Qāsim (Qasm according to Dhahabī) b. al-Faḍl.
8. Al-Awzā^{c}ī, ^{c}Abd al-Raḥmān b. al ^{c}Amr (d. 157 A.H.).
9. Ibn Jurayj, ^{c}Abd al-Malik (d. 150 A.H.)
10. Al-A^{c}mash, Sulaymān b. Mahrān (d. 148 A.H.)
11. Shayba b. Niṣāḥ.
12. ^{c}AbdAllāh b. Abī Bakr b. Muḥammad b. ^{c}Amr b. Hazm al-Anṣārī

---

1. Op cit.

13. ᶜAbdAllah b. ᶜAṭā'.

14. Bassām al-Ṣayrafī.

15. Ḥarb b. Surayj

16. Ḥajjāj b. Arṭāt.

17. Muḥammad b. Sūqa.

18. Makḥūl b. Rāshid (d. 115).

19. Maᶜmar or Muᶜammar b. Yaḥyā b. Sāmsām.

Ibn Hajar's list does not appear to be complete for al-Dhahabī' (d.748 A.H.)[1], includes some more names not given in the Ibn Hajar's Tahdhīb like:-

1. Rabīᶜa al-Rā'y (d.136 A.H.) and
2. Murra b. Khālid.

Abū Nuᶜaym al-Isfahānī (d. 136 A.H.)[2] has even more names not mentioned by Ibn Hajar. They are:

1. ᶜAtā'b. Abī Rabāḥ (d. 114 A.H.)
2. Jābir al-Juᶜfī (d. 128 A.H.)
3. Abān b. Taghlib (d. 141 A.H.)
4. Layth b. Abī Salim/Sulaym

In fact Ibn Hajar, himself when ending the list of

---

1. Ta'rīkh al-Islam, vol. 4, p. 299.
2. Hilyat al-Awlīyā', vol. 3, p. 188.

names mentions 'and others', obviously implying he has not been able to include all of them. Moreover, when he has dealt with individual scholars he mentions some more people like Ziyād b. al-Mundhir, Abū al-Jārūd and ᶜAbdAllāh b. Abū Bakr b. ᶜAmr b. Hazm as having reported traditions from al-Bāqir.

The names given in all the three works will reveal some outstanding scholars who had formed their own study circles, such as al-Zuhrī, al-Awzāᶜī, Ibn Jurayj, al-Aᶜmash, Makḥūl and others. Some like al-Zuhrī attained great fame not only for his share in collecting the traditions[1] but also for being the author of many other works, famous among which are the Tanzīl al Qur'ān and the Mansūkh al-Qur'an. These two works have come down to us in a single manuscript dated 653 A.H.[2] Makḥūl, the Syrian jurist who narrated traditions from al-Bāqir collected some of the Prophetic traditions and some juristic decisions based on the rulings of the Companions in a book called Kitāb al-Sunan.[3] The traditions narrated by ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān b. Hurmuz al-Aᶜrāj who reported from al-Bāqir as well,

---

1. Mālik Muwaṭṭā' (recension of Zurqānī) I p.10 Huliyāt al-awlīyā' III p. 363. For more details, see ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān Hāfiz, op. cit. p. 238.

2. For more details see Hāfiz's Ph.D thesis on Zuhrī pp.162ff.

3. Fihrist 227; Al-Zirkilī Aᶜlam VIII 212.

were also collected by Abū al-Zinād (d. 131 A.H.) in a worked called Kitāb ma rawāhu al Aᶜrāj.[1] ᶜAbd al-Malik b. ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz b. Jurayj (d. 150 A.H.) who compiled the Kitāb al-Sunan and who is considered to be one of the compiler of ḥadīth and sunna in Islam[2] was also a transmitter of al-Bāqir's. Another transmitter of al-Bāqir who was highly esteemed was ᶜAbd al-Raḥman b. ᶜAmr al-Awzāᶜī.[3] He was a Syrian and he too wrote a book called Kitāb al-Sunan fi al-Fiqh[4] and was in fact the founder of a legal school.

Al-Bāqir's reports in al-Ṭabarī's (d. 310 A.H.) Tarīkh reveal few narrators of his, such as:

1. Ishāq b. ᶜAbdAllāh b. Abū Farwa.[5]
2. Muḥammad b. Ishaq.[6]
3. ᶜAmmār al-Duhnī.[7]

---

1. Tahdhīb VI, p.172; Samᶜānī Ansāb p.173.
2. Dhahabī Ta'rīkh VI, p.559; Tahdhīb VI, 403-4.
3. Ibn Saᶜd VII, ii 185; Tahdhīb VI, pp.238-42 Hiliyāt al-Awlīyā' VI, 135-49.
4. Fihrist p.227.
5. Al-Ṭabarī Ta'rīkh, vol. 2 pp. 410, 485; Vol. 5, pp. 153 ff.
6. Al-Ṭabarī Ta'rīkh, vol. 2 pp. 446; Vol. 3 pp. 73.
7. Ibid, vol.5 pp.347ff and 389 reporting the murder of Ḥusayn at Karbalā'.

4. ᶜUqba b. Bashīr al-Asadī.[1]

However, it must be borne in mind that some among the whole list of reporters were actually al-Bāqir's associates more so than his narrators, even though they may have reported traditions from him at times. For instance scholars like Zuhrī and ᶜAtā'b. Abī Rabāḥ despite having been included in his list of transmitter by non-Shīᶜite writers were in fact his contemporaries. They, in fact could be regarded as transmitters of al-Bāqir's father, ᶜAlī, Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn. Zuhrī, as pointed out earlier was definitely a student of Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn, while ᶜAtā' is believed to have been a disciple of Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn.[2] However, this might be a later Shīᶜite interpretation in view of the fact that the two men were very close. ᶜAtā' himself was quite a prestigious scholar and his knowledge about the rites of the pilgrimage, of which al-Bāqir himself was an expert, was such that al-Bāqir said thus about him:-

> "No one remains today who is more learned than ᶜAta'b. Abī Rabāḥ in respect of the <u>manasik</u> (laws) of <u>hajj</u>"[3]

---

1. <u>Ibid</u>, vol.5 pp.448

2. Ibn Dāwūd <u>Kitāb al-Rijāl</u> (Teheran 1342 A.H.) 79.

3. Ibn Saᶜd, vol.5, p.344-5; Abū Nuᶜaym <u>Hilyāt al-Awliyā'</u> Vol. 3 p.311.

OLDER AND YOUNGER SCHOLARS DURING AL-BĀQIR'S TIME (b. 57 - d.c. 120 A.H.)

	MECCA	MEDINA	KUFA	BASRA	SYRIA
1	Mujāhid b. Jabr (d. after 100 A.H.)	Jābir b. ʿAbdallāh (d.c. 78 A.H.)	Ibrāhīm al-Nakhāʾī (d. 95-6 A.H.)	Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110 A.H.)	al-Awzāʿī (d. 157 A.H.)
2	ʿAṭāʾ b. Abi Rabāḥ (d. 114/5 A.H.)	Saʿīd al-Musayyib (d. 93/4 A.H.)	Masrūq	Ibn Sīrin (d. 110 A.H.)	Makḥūl (d. 115 A.H.)
3	Ṭāwus b. Kaysān (d. 106 A.H.)	Urwa b. Zubayr (d. 94 A.H.)	Shaʿbī (d. 110 A.H.)	Qatāda b. Diʿāma	
4	ʿIkrima, mawlā Ibn ʿAbbās (d. 105-7 A.H.)	Ibn Utba (d. 94 or 98 A.H.)	Ibn Ḥammād (d. 120 A.H.)		
5		Khārīja b. Zayd (d. 99/100 A.H.)	Ibn Abī Layla (d. 148 A.H.)		
6		Sālim b. Ibn ʿUmar (d.c. 106 A.H.)	Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150 A.H.)		
7		Nafiʿ, mawla of Ibn ʿUmar (d.c. 117 A.H.)	Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161 A.H.)		
8		Sulaymān b. Yasār (d. 107 A.H.)	Wakīʿ b. Jarrāḥ		
9		ʿAbdallāh b. Dīnār (d. 127 A.H.)	Ḥakam b. Utayba (d. 114 A.H.)		
10		Ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī (d. 124 A.H.)			
11		Rabiʿa b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān (d. 136 A.H.)			
12		Ṣāliḥ b. Kaysān			
13		ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. Hurmuz al-Aʿraj (d. 117 A.H.)			
14		Muḥammad b. al-Munkadir (d. 131 A.H.)			
15		Qāsim b. Muḥammad (d. 106 A.H.)			
16		Yaḥya b. Saʿīd (d. 143 A.H.)			
17		Mālik b. Anas (d. 179 A.H.)			

The list (above) drawn up to show some of the older and younger scholars during al-Bāqir's life-time reveals that his period of time coincided with some of the most outstanding and distinguished scholars in the Islamic empire. Although there were giant figures existing in each centre such as al-Zuhrī in Medina, ᶜAtā'b. Abī Rabāḥ in Mecca, Ibn Ḥammād and Shaᶜbī in Kūfa, Ibn Sirīn and Qatādā in Baṣra and Makḥūl in Syria, yet it can be seen that the number of scholars in Medina far exceeded those in other cities. This does not necessarily mean that the Medinese were better than their counterparts but it at least shows the degree of intellectual activity going on in the city. This, in turn, brings out the background in which al-Bāqir grew up and the circle in which he mixed. His contact with scholars was by no means limited to those of Medina for as mentioned earlier on, he had acquaintances as well as associates, transmitters and disciples in Mecca, Kūfa, Baṣra as well as in Syria and Yemen.

The list also illustrates that al-Bāqir was a younger contemporary of some of the "seven lawyers of Medina": Saᶜid Ibn al-Musayyib, ᶜUrwa b. al-Zubayr, Abū Bakr Ibn ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān, ᶜUbaydAllāh Ibn ᶜAbdAllāh b. ᶜUtba, Khārija b. Zayd b. Thābit, Sulaymān b. Yasār and Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. Abū Bakr who in fact happened to be the father-in-law of al-Bāqir. He was

also an older contemporary of scholars such as Mālik b. Anas, Ibn ᶜUyayna, Ibn Abī Laylā, Abū Ḥanīfa, Sufyān al-Thawrī and al-Awzāᶜī. Amidst such eminent scholars, al-Bāqir stood as their equal if not better. In fact according to some scholars, he was not only viewed as one of the many distinguished scholars but that he stood head and shoulders above all of them.

(ii) <u>Shīᶜite circle</u>:-

From the Shīᶜa point of view, al-Bāqir's image is totally different for two reasons - firstly because he was one of the Imams and secondly because of the structural difference between Shīᶜite and Sunnite ḥadīth. The Shīᶜite ḥadīth[1] differs mainly with regard to the source of authority in Islam after the death of the Prophet. The Sunnīs assign the primary role of transmitting traditions to the Companions of the Prophet and so a Sunnite <u>isnād</u> will as a rule go back to a Companion who transmits from the Prophet. But Shīᶜite traditions are mainly a recording of statements made by the Prophet or by an Imam and transmitted to

---

1. For the collection and transmission of Shīᶜite hadīth, see E. Kohlberg's chapter in <u>Cambridge History of Arabic Literature</u> pp. 299ff. Also see Donaldson, D.M., <u>The Shīᶜite Religion</u> (London, 1933) chapter on the earliest collections of Shīᶜite traditions, pp. 218ff.

later generation by the disciples of each Imam.[1] This, in the Shīᶜite view, was because the Companions are fallible mortals and therefore cannot claim any authority to true knowledge and correct judgment while the Imams, in whom ultimate religious authority is vested, are by their very nature divinely protected from sin and error (ma'ṣūm). Moreover, the Shīᶜa argue[2] that the Companions could not serve as trustworthy transmitters because most, if not all, had acquiesced in, or even actively supported the rule of the first three caliphs.

This brief outline of the structural difference between Shīᶜite and Sunnite ḥadith will help us determine and appreciate al-Bāqir's image from a Shīᶜite point much better. Since Shīᶜite traditions are mainly the sayings of the Prophet or the Imams and since the Prophet and the Imams are considered infallible in Shīᶜite view, it is clear that their authority is final and unquestionable. As pointed out in the previous paragraph, al-Bāqir was one of the Shīᶜite Imams, therefore from the Shīᶜite point of view

---

1. There are some instances were the Companions do appear as transmitters from the Prophet but E. Kohlberg op.cit. maintains that the reason lay in in taqīya (precautionary dissimulation) as well as in sometimes providing a convincing argument in polemical works.

2. E. Kohlberg, op. cit. p. 300

his authority is absolute and indisputable. Yet one has to take into account the different attitudes and tendencies of the various disciples who transmitted from him. When one looks at the large number of Shīᶜite ḥadīths, some of these traditions tend to reflect these different attitudes and tendencies.

It is worth noting that here, although the term Shīᶜite is used, it must be taken to mean in this section in the Ithnāᶜasharī and the Ismāᶜīlī sense for the Zaydī approach appears more akin to the Sunnite view. Nevertheless, it is revealing that when al-Bāqir is quoted in some of their traditions[1], he is referred to as direct authority and his traditions are regarded as <u>marfūᶜ</u> i.e. traceable to the Prophet.[2] Jārūdīya[3] branch of the Zaydīya go as far as believing that every descendant of the Prophet, young or old, are all equal in their knowledge, even if they were still in their cradle and that "knowledge grew in their hearts just as rain makes the cultivated land (just as

---

1. See <u>Amālī Aḥmad b. ᶜĪsā</u> passim.

2. See Al-Saffār, <u>Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt</u> II p. 299 IV and VI p. 300. <u>apud</u>. Al-Sayyid Murtaḍa al-Askarī <u>Muqaddimat Mirāt al-ᶜUqūl</u> Vol. II (Tehran, 1398 A.H.) pp. 54-57. However, it is quite likely that most often al-Baqir spoke on his own authority as an Imam and it was only assumed that what he said was traceable to the Prophet.

3. Nawbakhtī, <u>Firaq</u> pp. 49-50.

truffles and grass) grow."[1] It is, of course, a case of hostile reporting as it is not very likely that the Jarudiya themselves made the comparison of the knowledge of the Prophet's descendants with truffles and grass. It is interesting to note that some of al-Baqir and al-Sadiq's traditions found in the Sunni sources also have family isnāds as mentioned earlier on.

Shi^{c}ite sources[2] suggest that al-Bāqir was the most learned man during his time as well as the greatest jurist of the period.[3] Other jurists from the khawāṣṣ (Shi^{c}a) and the ʿawāmm (non-Shi^{c}a) reported from him the ẓahir (external knowledge) concerning ḥalāl (what is permissible) and ḥarām (what is forbidden.)[4] He was called Bāqir-al-^{c}Ilm (One who splits open knowledge), says Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān, because he happened to be the first one among the Imams of the Prophet's family to split it open and disclose it. This became possible for him because he found his times more congenial; the ruling dynasty i.e. the Umayyads had taken a more softer approach now that their end was drawing near

---

1. ibid.
2. al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān, Kitab al-Manāqib li Ahl al-Bayt f. 299b.
3. al-Qāḍī al-Nu^{c}mān Sharh al-Akhbār f.64
4. al-Qāḍī al-Nu$_{c}$mān Sharh al Akhbār f.64

واخذ عنه ظاهرعلم الحلال والحرام اهل الفتنة من الخواص والعوام •

while others among them were busy leading a lavish and carefree life, full of sins.[1]

In another work of his, which is also still in a manuscript form he says:[2]

وسمي باقر العلم لانه كان أول من بقر عنه وتكلم فيه وصنفه واخذ عنه وعرف به وروى ذلك عنه اكابر رواة الشيعة والمشهورون بالسبق والمنسوبون الى العلم والحديث من العامة ممن ادرك عصره ولحق منهم ايامه من اكابر التابعين اثروا عنه وسمعوا منه • وكان عندهم وعند من تعقبهم من بعدهم وعند سائر اهل العلم قدوة فيه وغاية في الثقة لمن اخذ عنه وفيما يسند اليه حتى أن المقطوع من الحديث عندهم عنه بعد موصولا ويذكر مرفوعا لصدقه عندهم وثقته ولانه لا يقول: قال رسول الله " الا ماثبت عنه انه قد قاله وان لم يذكر اسناده وهم من روى عنه ذلك • وحجة رسول الله م حجة الوداع لم يروها الناس على تمام بما جاء فيه من الناس والاخبار الا عنه عن جابر بن عبد الله رضي الله عنه من رسول الله صلع حتى لقد بسط بعض المتأخرين منهم ما ذكر من الفرائض والسنن وشرح ذلك وبينه فكمل عنه كتاب كبير •

---

1. ibid.

وسمي باقر العلم لانه أول من بقر عنه من الائمة من آل محمد فاظهره وذلك لانه وجد في زمانه ليس منا من بني امية لقرب انقطاع ايامهم ولشغل من بقي منهم بلهوهم واثامهم •

2. Kitāb al-Manāqib li Ahl al-Bayt.....f. 299b.

"He was called Bāqir al-ᶜIlm i.e. One who splits open knowledge because he was the first one to split it open and talk about it as well as the first one to classify it. (That knowledge) was borrowed from him and he was known for it. The learned reporters of the Shiᶜa, those well-known with regard to the precedence in Islam (al-sibaq), and those affiliated with ᶜIlm and hadith from among the non-Shiᶜa who lived until his period of time heard that from him and transmitted that (knowledge) on his authority. They and those who came after them and the rest of the people of knowledge had in him an example to follow. He was considered among them to hold the utmost degree of reliability for those who received (traditions) from him. (This strength was also for) what had been ascribed to him as its first authority so much so that when a tradition that was technically maqtuᶜ (i.e. a tradition that goes back no further than the first generation after Prophet Muhammad) was reported by al-Baqir, it was regarded as mawṣūl i.e. linked and was mentioned as marfuᶜ i.e. that which is traceable to the Prophet. This was because of their trust and reliance on him as well as because he never said that 'the Prophet had said' except when it was firmly established that he had indeed said that even if he neither mentioned his isnād nor named the person from whom he narrated it. The pilgrimage of the Messenger of Allah i.e. the farewell pilgrimage has not been reported fully by the people,

according to what has come down to us from the practices and from the reports except from him (i.e. al-Bāqir) on the authority of Jābir b. ᶜAbdAllāh, may God be pleased with, from the Messenger of Allāh, peace be upon him, such that one of the later (scholars) has expounded the religious duties and practices mentioned by him, has commented on that and explained it, and a large book has been completed on his authority."[1]

The above passage of Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān clearly depicts to us al-Bāqir's image in the Shīᶜa world and the rank that he had attained outside his own group. The significant aspect that comes out in the above passage is al-Bāqir's reputation as a traditionist. Undoubtedly, he was a prominent traditionist but the fact that the 'interrupted' or 'broken' traditions were regarded as 'linked' and traceable to the Prophet when they came from al-Bāqir speaks for itself regarding his esteem and his image in the Shīᶜite circle.[2] It is

---

1. al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān K. al Manāqib.....f. 299b.

2. It is to be noted however that the Sunnite hadīth authorities do not say this although a few traditions are found in their works where the isnāds stop at al-Bāqir which does in a way imply what Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān says about al-Bāqir. On the other hand the fact that al-Bāqir is so rarely quoted in Sunnite hadith collections may well be because in the Sunnite view his isnāds were formally defective although that is not contradicted by his being considered thiqa as a transmitter.

also worth noting that in the author's view, the farewell pilgrimage has been reported fully only by al-Bāqir who had asked Jābir b. ᶜAbdAllāh about it. The latter, who is believed to have accompanied the Prophet, informed al-Bāqir about things that the Prophet did since the time he left Medina until the completion of the pilgrimage.[1]

Al-Bāqir is believed to have recounted reports about the beginnings of history (mubtada')[2] and stories of the Prophet. The account of the campaigns of the Prophet (maghāzī) were written on his authority.[3]

> "People followed the practices of the Prophet (sunan) on his authority and relied on him with regard to the rites of the pilgrimage which he reported on the authority of the Messenger of God, may God bless him and his family."[4]

Many muslim scholars and jurists transmitted the principle features of religious (maᶜālim) on his authority. He, in fact became a signpost of knowledge even in his own family for he surpassed them all by his

---

1. See Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān's Sharḥ al-Akhbār f.64-65.

2. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān in his Sharḥ f. 64-66 has an interesting account of what al-Bāqir said regarding the beginnings of the House of Ka'ba and the creation of mankind as well as the covenant between man and God.

3. See Howard's transl. of Mufīd's Kitāb al-Irshād p. 397.

4. ibid. This view of Mufīd's tallies with that of Qāḍī al Nucmān.

outstanding merit (fadl) in traditional knowledge (ʿIlm), ascetism and leadership.[1] His fame travelled wide and far so much so that proverbs were coined about him and verses were written to describe him. The poet al-Qurāzī had said the following lines in praise of al-Bāqir:

> "O, (You) who split open knowledge (making it available to the people of piety
>
> And the best of those who seek to answer the call of the Exalted.[2]

Malik b. ʿAyān al-Juhnī is even more generous in his praise for al-Bāqir and has said the following regarding him.

اذا طلب الناس علم القرآن ـــــ فكانت قريش عليه عيلا

وان تسأل من ابن بنت النبي ـــــ رأيت لذلك فرعا طوالا

نجوم تهلل للمدلجين ـــــ جبال تورث علما جبالا •

---

1. Howard op cit. p.393. Also see Ibn Shahrashūb, Manāqib apud. ʿAmilī ʿAyān al-Shīʿa IV, pp. 3 ff mentions "No one from among the sons of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn will be as learned as al-Bāqir in the sciences such as tafsīr, kalām, futya, aḥkām, ḥalāl and ḥarām."

1. Qāḍī al-Nuʿmān, Sharḥ al-Akhbār, f.68; Manāqib f. 300.

When people seek knowledge of the Qur'an, the Quraysh rely upon him.

If someone asked who is the son of the daughter of the Prophet, I realised that for that there are wide branches i.e. many descendants.

(They are like) stars that provide light for the night travellers, (They are like) mountains that bequeaths vast knowledge.

The traditions that have come down to us from al-Bāqir in Shīᶜite sources of all three persuasions, Zaydī, Ithnāᶜ Asharī and Ismāᶜīlī[1] cover a vast spectrum, ranging from problems of the material world to questions concerning the spiritual life. Due to the nature of their contents these sayings have influenced nearly every branch of Shīᶜite learning. Besides the Qur'ān, these traditions of al-Bāqir as well as those of his son, al-Ṣādiq form the backbone of Shīᶜite jurisprudence (fiqh) and Shīᶜite theology (kalām) too, would be inexplicable and incomprehensible without them. Thus, his importance from the Shīᶜite point of view is not difficult to gauge. It comes as no surprise then, when he is regarded by the Shiᶜa as the most versatile and erudite man of the epoch. As pointed out earlier on he cannot be held responsible

---

1. al-Murādī, Amālī Aḥmad b. ᶜĪsā passim (Zaydī) al-Kulayni, al-Kāfī, vol.I and II passim (Ithnāᶜ Asharī). al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān, Daᶜā im al-Islam and Ma wujida min Kitāb al-Īḍāḥ passim (Ismāīlī).

for some of the forged traditions that go under his name. His traditions were handed down to posterity by his son and successor, al-Ṣādiq by his other sons and relations as well as by his associates and disciples who were innumerble from what one gathers in the extant Shīᶜite sources.[1]

(iii) Shīᶜite Associates of al-Bāqir

In this section an attempt will be made to look at certain individuals who appear to have been involved with al-Bāqir. All the stories in the extant sources cannot always be taken at their face value. However, it is worth looking at some of the other anecdotes which may help us to paint a picture of individuals who may have been involved intimately with al-Bāqir. The task is rendered difficult not only because shīᶜite organization was largely underground but also because there were several competing Shīᶜite organizations. The other difficulty arises from the fact that as an eminent traditionist, there were numerous people narrating traditions from al-Bāqir who were not necessarily his followers but who nevertheless have been mentioned among his associates by some sources. Thus the task of determining who were merely his

---

1. al-Barqī Kitāb al-Rijāl, pp.9-16; Ibn Dāwūd Rijāl passim; al-Kashshī, Maᶜrifat al-Rijāl passim; al-Tusi K. al-Rijal passim.

transmitters and who were his real followers is not an easy job. Moreover, there were some who were sympathetic with the Alid cause but were not necessarily Shīᶜite.

Al-Bāqir himself resided in Medina and although he did have a few followes there as well as in Mecca, Baṣra and Syria, yet sources suggest that the bulk of his folowers were mainly Kūfans. For the sake of brevity, not all his followers will be mentioned but only those who attained fame and were in some ways connected with enhancing al-Bāqir's position.

a) KŪFA

The chief representative of the Imam in Kūfa was Abū ᶜAbdAllāh Jābir b. Yazīd b. al-Ḥārith al-Juᶜfī (d.128/745-6).[1] Views regarding his merit as a traditionist are greatly divergent. Some authorities maintian, among them Sufyān al-Thawrī[2] he was truthful (saduq) and trustworthy (thiqa) as a traditionist and

1. al-Samᶜanī, ᶜAbd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad, Kitāb al-Ansāb (Leiden, 1912) p.113; Kashshi, Rijāl, pp. 191 ff; Najāshī, Rijal, pp.93-94.

2. Kashshī op.cit p.129; Dhahabī Mizān al-Iᶜtidāl Samᶜanī calls him a liar while Najashī thinks he was weak.

that only his transmitters ᶜAmr b. Shamir al-Juᶜfī, Mufaḍḍal b. Ṣāliḥ al-Aṣadī2 and Munakhkhal b. Jamīl al-Aṣadī Bayyaᶜ al Jawarī (a seller of slave girls)3 were liars who introduced many spurious traditions. Whatever may have been his status as a traditionist outside the Shīᶜite circle, there is little doubt that among Shīᶜite traditionists he was a striking personality and was considered to be an enthusiastic follower of al-Bāqir4.

Jābir extolled the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt and his devotion to al-Bāqir can be ascertained from the way in which he addresssed him - "The trustee of the trustees and inheritor of the knowledge of the Prophets" (waṣī al-awṣīya' wa wārith ᶜIlm al-anbīyā')5. He claimed to have witnessed mircales of the Imam and is believed to have been recognised as the bāb (Gate)

---

1. Al-Hā'irī, Muḥammad b. Ismāᶜil Muntahā al-Maqāl (Teheran 1302) p.230: al-Tafrishī, Naqd al-Rijāl fol. 147 b. These references have been taken from Rajkowskī's thesis. For more details see Madelung's art. Djābir al-DJuᶜfi in the Suppl. of the E.I. See also Halm in Der Islam LVIII (1981) pp. 29ff.

2. al-Hā'irī op.cit. 307-8.

3. He was accused of extremism and regarded as a 'weak' traditionist, see al-Hā'irī op.cit p.311 Najashi Rijāl p.298.

4. Kashshi Rijāl p.126-7.

5. Kashshi Rijāl p.126-7.

of al-Bāqir[1] who, it is reported, related to him seventy secret traditions[2]. It is also believed that Jābir confessed before al-Bāqir that the secrets which the Imam had imparted to him at times stirred him so much that something like madness overtook him. Al-Bāqir is reported to have said to him, "when you feel like that, go into the desert (lit. the mountain), dig a hole and put your head into it."[3]

Some people were either impatient regarding traditions related by Jābir or considered him to be a madman.[4] However, this reputation for madness was to one day save him from serious trouble when Caliph Hishām ordered him to be sent to Damascus for an enquiry into his activities and people testified before the Amir that he was insane.[5] Despite all his assertions, the Shīᶜa do not reject him as a ghālī[6]

---

1. Kashshī Rijāl 129-130; Majlisī Biḥār al-Anwār, Vol. XI p.98.

2. Majlisī Biḥār al-Anwār Vol. XI p.98. Another tradition maintains that he claimed to have known 50,000 or even 70,000 traditions which he would not relate to anyone. See Kashshī Rijāl p. 128. Ibn Hajar Tahdhīb II p.49; Dhahabī Mizān I p.155

3. Kashshī Rijāl p.128

4. ibid.

5. al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I p.251; Kashshī, Rijāl p.128

6. Ibn Qutayba Maᶜārif p.267 calls him a ghālī and Ibn Hajar calls him a Sabā'ite. See Tahdhīb II p.50

(one who exaggerates) perhaps because he remained faithful to the Imam in the conflict with al-Mughira b. Sa^{c}īd al-Ijlī whom he reviled and cursed.[1]

Jābir is quoted as the transmitter of some traditions in the Umm al-Kitāb which is supposed to contain answers of al-Bāqir to the different questions asked by the followers.[2] Jābir is also the main narrator of al-Bāqir in Risālat al-Ju^{c}fī which is believed to contain Ismā^{c}īlī doctrines.[3] It is difficult to determine whether Jabir did really narrate all those traditions attributed to him and that too from al-Bāqir or whether some or many were later fathered upon him.[4] Whatever may be the case, there is little doubt that he was an ardent follower of al-Bāqir.

---

1. Kashshī Rijāl p.126-7: Hā'irī, Muntaha p.73 See Madelung's art. Djabir al-DJu^{c}fī in the Suppl. of the E I who says that there may have been some relationship between him and al-Mughira since according to the Sunni heresiographers Jābir became the leader of Mughira's extremist Shī^{c}ī followers after the latter was killed in 119/737 by Khālid al-Qasrī, governor of Kūfa.

2. W.Ivanow, "Notes surl' Ummu'l kitāb de Ismaeli del' Asie Centrale" REI (1932) pp.419-482. Also see Der Islam XXIII (1936) where Ivanow has edited the Ummu'l kitāb.

3. Edward E. Salisbury, "Translation of an unpublished Arabic Risala" JAOS 3 (1853) 107-193.

4. Ibn Dawud K. al-Rijāl, pp.9-11 Kashshi Rijāl, pp.419 ff.

Abān b. Taghlib (d. 141 A.H.)[1] was another associate of al-Bāqir. He was an important and outstanding jurist-traditionist of his time. Formerly an associate of Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn, he lived long enough to narrate traditions even from al-Bāqir's son, al-Ṣādiq. Al-Bāqir is reported to have said to Abān:

> "Sit in the mosque of Kūfa and give legal judgments to the people. Indeed, I would like to see among my Shīᶜa, people like you."[2]

Aban's reputation for learning was quite high and by the time he reached al-Ṣādiq's Imamate, it was such that whenever he visited Medina, people would give way to him and allowed him to use the column where the Prophet used to lean against in the mosque.[3]

In due course al-Bāqir was able to attract three of the previous pupils of al-Ḥākam b. ᶜUtayba. One of the most eminent among them was Abū al-Ḥasan b. Aᶜyan b.Sunsan, popularly known as al-Zurāra. He and his two brothers Ḥumrān and Ḥamza b. Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllāh al-Ṭayyār later changed their allegiance and joined

---

1. Ibn Dāwūd K. al-Rijāl pp.9-11. Kashshī Rijāl pp.419 ff.

2. Ibn Dāwūd op cit. p.10. Quoting Kashshī, Jafri says that it was al-Ṣādiq who said that to Abān. See p.310 of his Origins.

3. Ibn Dāwūd, op.cit.

al-Bāqir's group. It is believed Humran was the first to take the step.[1] He in fact was formerly a close associate of Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn and later came to be an extremely committed follower of al-Bāqir.[2] Ḥamza is believed to have hesitated between the various claimants and finally chose to follow al-Bāqir.[3]

The acquisition of Zurāra appears to have been quite significant for he not only was regarded as an eminent traditionist but also a famous theologian of his time who had a wide circle of disciples in Kūfa.[4]

Shīᶜite sources suggest that Zurāra played a significant role in the development of Shīᶜite thought. He is one of the the most oft-quoted authorities in all the major books of the Shīᶜa, be it Ithnāᶜashari or Ismāᶜīlī.[5] Zurāra survived al-Bāqir and became one of

---

1. Hā'irī Muntaha p.120;

2. Kashshī, pp.161, 167 ff.

3. ibid. pp.276, 347ff. See Ibn Dāwūd Rijāl p.135 who says that Shaykh Ṭūsī in his K. al-Rijāl has mistaken Ḥamza's title al-Ṭayyār to be his father's for he writes Ḥamza b. al-Ṭayyār. This must be because in the K. al-Rijāl his name is given as Ḥamza b. Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllah al-Ṭayyār.

4. Kashshī Rijāl pp.133-61 gives a detailed account of Zurāra and his circle.

5. See al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī I and II passim as well as other books of tradition.

the closest adherents of al-Ṣādiq. However, later, al-Ṣādiq apparently disavowed him but Kashshī[1] tells us that in order to save Zurāra, al-Ṣādiq had acted in the same way as the Prophet Khidr, when he sank a ship to save it from being taken from its owners by a tyrannous king.

Apart from Zurāra, another striking figure in Kūfa was Muḥammad b. Muslim b. Riyaḥ al-Ṭā'ifī.[2] A mawlā of Thaqīf, he was a miller by trade and popularly known as al-Aʿwar 'the one-eyed'. He was regarded with great esteem in the jurist circles of Kūfa and happened to be the contemporary of famous jurists like Ibn Abi Layla, Abū Ḥanifa and Sharik al-ʿĀdī. While Zurāra was a traditionist and a speculative theologian, Muḥammad b. Muslim not only had a sound knowledge of traditions but was also a practical lawyer, renowned for his quick decisions. He appears to have been a famous zāhid (ascetic)[3] as well, who died in the year 150/267-8.

---

1. Kashshī Rijāl pp.133 ff.
2. Kashshī Rijāl, pp.169, 238.
3. Massignon Lexique p.147 reference quoted from Rajkowski's thesis.

Abū al-Qāsim Burayd b.Muᶜāwiya al-ʿIjlī, an Arab by origin was yet another adherent of al-Bāqir[1] as well as of al-Ṣādiq for he died in the year 150/267-8, the same year in which Muḥammad b. Muslim died. Burayd was a notable jurist and had a special place with both Imams, al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq. Al-Bāqir is believed to have promised him Paradise (as he did to Layth al-Bakhtarī al-Murādī,[2] Muḥammad b. Muslim and Zurāra).[3] Burayd later became one of the main authorities on Shīᶜite fiqh.

Abū Baṣīr Layth al-Bakhtarī al-Murādī was yet another follower of al-Bāqir and later of al-Ṣādiq who attained great fame as Shīᶜite faqīh (jurist) and traditionist. He was a mawlā of Banū Asad. Al-Ṣādiq is believed to have said about him, Burayd, Zurāra and and Muḥammad b. Muslim that they were the "tent pegs of the world" and that without them the Prophetic traditions would have been lost. They were he added, "the fastest runners and the closest associates" of the Imam.[4]

---

1. Ibn Dāwūd Rijal p.65; Kashshī Rijāl, p. 155.
2. See the paragraph below.
3. See Kashshī Rijāl, p.155.
4. Kashshi Rijāl p.113 and Hā'irī's Muntaha pp. 249-250.

Abū Khālid al-Kābulī Kankar[1] and Abū Ḥamza al-Thumālī[2] formerly disciples of Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn were also among al-Bāqir's followers. Abū Hamza, according to Ibn Dāwūd was a trustworthy transmitter and is believed to have written a book.[3] Many traditions, especially those relating to miracles may be traced to him.[4]

Abū al-Qāsim al-Fuḍayl b.Yasār al-Nahdī[5] was another favourite of al-Baqir and later of al-Ṣādiq who is believed to have said of him what the Prophet had said of Salmān al-Fārisī: "Al-Fuḍayl is from us, the People of the House."[6]

Al-Kumayt b. Zayd[7] occupied a unique place in al-Bāqir's following. He was a renowned poet of his

---

1. al-Barqī Rijāl p.9 (he later joined the Zaydīya).
2. Ibid, also so Ibn Dāwūd Rijāl p.77 and Kashshī's Rijāl pp.201ff. al-Thumālī's actual name was Thābit b. Dinar.
3. Ibn Dāwūd Rijāl, p.77 quoting Fihrist, p.127.
4. Kashshī Rijāl pp.201ff.
5. Kashshī op.cit. pp.213f. He was an Arab from Basra. al-Barqī Rijāl p.11.
6. Ibid. See also Rajkowski quoting Hā'irī. Muntaha p.243; Najāshī Rijāl p.219 calls him al-Faḍl.
7. Aghānī XVI pp.330 ff; Jāḥiẓ, Bayān I p.46.

period and although he was a devout Shīᶜite he was still friendly with al-Ṭirrimah, a Sufrite-Khārijite and a poet of the Ṭayyi' tribe.[1]

Kumayt had a significant role to play, for his verses, devoted to the praises of the Ahl al-Bayt, the Hāshimīyāt were such that they could be appreciated by the public at large.[2] The fact that on occasion he celebrates the glory of Umayyads ought not to prejudice his sincerity to Banū Hāshim. This was done in order to placate the Caliph Hishām b. Abd al-Malik to whose attention his work was brought by the Viceroy of Iraq, Yusuf b. ᶜUmar.[3]. At heart, Kumayt was with the Banū Hāshim. In his view the power of the Umayyads was an illegitimate one[4] and the claims of the Banū

---

1. Aghānī XVI pp.330ff; Jāhiz Bayān I p.46.

2. Kumayt does not go beyond the limits of 'tashhayu hasan' unlike al-Sayyid al-Himyarī who offended many people by vilifying the person of the first two caliphs. See Aghānī vo.7, p.41, lines 15-17, (reference quoted from Arendonk's Le Débuts p.15, n.2)

3. Aghānī XVI p.333.

4. Kumayt Hāshimīyāt 2nd poem verses 28, 31 and 37 ff.

Hāshim were based on their being inheritors[1] and even found support in the Qur'ān.[2]

Kumayt's work has come down to us and serves as one of the most ancient evidence regarding the doctrine of Imamate.

Another striking personality in Kūfa was Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī b. Nuᶜmān al-Aḥwal.[3] He was one of the most devoted adherents of al-Bāqir whose claims he defended against Zayd. He later became an equally committed followers of Jaᶜfar al-Ṣādiq and distinguished himself in theology. He was known for his sharp and stimulating answers in debates and disputes with his adversaries. He is reported to have held heated discussions with the famous ʿscholar, Abū Ḥanifa.[4] He defended the rights of the Imam and believed in complete obedience to the Imam who possesses the supreme knowledge to guide

---

1. Kumayt Hāshimīyāt verses 38 ff.

2. ibid verse 29 quoting Qur'ānic verses 40-46 of Sūra Ha Mim. He also quotes verse 22;42; 33:33; 17:28 and 8:42.

3. Kashshī Rijāl pp.185ff; Naǰashī Rijāl p.228; Ibn Nadim Fihrist p.176;

4. Kashshī Rijāl p.187; Najāshī op.cit.

mankind. Sources suggest[1] he wrote a number of works including Kitāb al-Imama and K. al-radd ᶜalā al-Muᶜtazila fi Imamat al Mafḍūl.

BAṢRA:

The city of Baṣra was supposed to be generally anti-Shīᶜite but al-Bāqir is believed to have had a few followers there as well. Muḥammad b. Marwān al-Baṣrī was one such person. He was a Kūfan by birth but living in Baṣra. In al-Kashshī's view he was a descendant of Abū al-Aswad al-Du'alī.[2]

Another eminent follower of al-Bāqir was Ismāᶜīl b. al-Faḍl al-Hāshimī,[3] a descendant of ᶜAbd al-Muṭṭalib. He was a trustworthy transmitter, living in Baṣra. Still another adherent of al-Baqir in Basra was Mālik b. Aᶜyan al-Juhanī[4] who should not be confused with his namesake, Mālik b. Aᶜyan, Zurāra's brother. Al-Juhanī survived his Imam, al-Bāqir and died during the lifetime of al-Ṣādiq.

---

1. Ibn Nadim Fihrist p.176; Najāshī op.cit.
2. Kashshī Rijāl, p.214; Hā'irī, Muntaha, p.293.
3. Ibn Dāwūd Rijāl, p.58, Kashshi Rijāl, p.143.
4. Kashshī Rijāl, p.214; Hā'irī Muntaha, p.293

Burd al-Iskāf[1] and Bassām al-Ṣayrafī[2] were two other narrators of both al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq but it is not known whether they were Baṣrans or whether they were his followers as well.

Two other associates of al-Bāqir whose residence is not known were Bashīr al-Nabbāl[3] and Bukayr b. Aʿyan b. Sunsun.[4] They lived until al-Ṣādiq's time. Still other associates of al-Bāqir whose residential area is unknown were al-Ḥārith b. al-Mughīra al-Nasrī[5], Ḥabāba al-Wālibīya[6] and Ḥabīb al-Sijistānī.[7] Al-Ḥārith was a follower of al-Ṣādiq as well and is belived to have been extremely reliable as a narrator.[8] Habāba had been an adherent of the Imams even before the time of al-Ḥusayn, whereas Ḥabīb al-Sijistānī who was an associate of three successive Imams, Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn, al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq, belonged to the Khārijites

---

1. Ibn Dāwud Rijāl p.65.
2. Ibid p.69; Kashshī p.159. Bassām is also mentioned in Ibn Ḥajar's Tahdhīb among al-Bāqir's transmitters. See Vol.9-10, p.351.
3. Ibn Dāwūd Rijāl, p.71; Kashshī, p.235
4. Ibn Dāwūd Rihāl p.72; Kashshī Rijāl p.120.
5. Ibd Dāwūd Rijāl pp.96-97; Kashshī p.216.
6. ibid p.98 : Kashshī p.75.
7. ibid pp. 98-99.
8. al-Barqī, Rijāl p. 12ff.

initially, according to Ibn Dāwūd and later returned to them. Still other associates of al-Bāqir were Ismā^{c}īl b. Jabir al-Ju^{c}fi, Ismā^{c}īl b. ^{c}Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ju^{c}fī, Ismā^{c}īl al-Azraq and many others.

MECCA

Al-Bāqir's group in Mecca consisted of very few notables. One of the most important fuqaha' there was Ma^{c}rūf b. Kharrabudh, a mawlā of the Quraysh. His reputation as a traditionist could not be compared to that of Zurara and was sometimes regarded as weak. According to Kashshī[1] he seems to have been of moderate Shī^{c}ite attitude.

Apart from Ma^{c}rūf, another main figure in Mecca was Maymūn b. al-Aswad al-Qaddāḥ, al-Makkī, a mawlā of the Banū Makhzūm.[2] All sorts of legends and myths have been invented by later non-Shī^{c}ite sources against this Maymūn and his son ^{c}AbdAllah. This has been cleared by Ivanow's painstaking research[3] which demonstrates that the story of Ibn al-Qaddāḥ, the supposed founder of

---

1. Rijal pp.211,238; Ha'iri Muntaha al-Maqal (Tehran, 1302) pp.304-5.

2. al-Barqi, Rijal p.15.

3. Ivanow W. The Alleged Founder of Ismailism (Bombay, 1946). See also his Rise of the Fatimids (Bombay 1942), pp.127-156.

Ismāᶜīlism "is nothing but an aetiological myth"[1] which was invented incidentally and later gradually embellished and developed during the course of transmistion, both oral and written.[2]

According to Ivanow then, Maymūn al-Qaddāḥ was an influential resident of Mecca, who was a devout servant of Imam Muḥammad al-Bāqir and his son Jaᶜfar.[3] In his view, it is quite possible that Maymun was a merchant of some sort and he also appears to have been in charge of the Imam's property in Mecca.[4]. Maymun does not seem to have been educated but had an impressive personality. He had several sons, of whom ᶜAbdAllāh[5] appears to have gained fame as the alleged progenitor of the Ismāᶜīlis. Being in the service of the Imams, he had the chance of hearing from them and it is quite possible that he committed to writing what he heard although he seems to have had little time for the proper study of traditions.[6] Moreover he

---

1. Ivanow, The Alleged Founder, p.2
2. ibid.
3. Ibid, p.78-79.
4. Ibid.
5. ᶜAbdAllāh seems to have been at least a young man before the death of al-Bāqir (see Ivanow Op.cit p.69).
6. Ivanow, The Alleged Founder, p.79.

restricted himself to traditions only from al-Ṣādiq. He does not seem to have been in contact with Musa al-Kāẓim and there are no traditions reported by him from Musa al-Kāẓim. On the other hand it is possible that he may have recorded some but these were probably lost.[1]

Other eminent followers of al-Bāqir were Muḥammad b. Ismāᶜīl b. Bazīᶜ including other members of the Bazīᶜ family,[2] Abū Hārūn and his namesake Abū Hārūn al-Makfuf,[3] ᶜUqba b. Bashīr al-Asadī,[4] Aslam al-Makkī, formerly a mawlā of Ibn al-Ḥanafīya[5] and Nājiya b. Abū Muᶜadh b. Muslim al-Nahwī.[6] It must be pointed out however, that it is difficult to determine where these above named persons lived.

Some of the other followers of al-Bāqir such as Abū al-Jārūd Ziyad b. Mundhir, Fuḍayl b. Rassān and Abū Khālid al-Wāsitī left al-Bāqir's group to join

---

1. ibid.
2. Najāshī p.233; Hā'irī Muntaha p.263.
3. Kashshī, pp.144-145; Hā'irī op.cit. p.353; al-Barqī p.14.
4. Ibn Dāwūd p.13.
5. Ibn Dāwūd p.13.
6. Ibn Dāwūd p.13.

the Zaydīya movement.[1] Still other followers of his such as Qays b. Rabi^{c} and his companion abandoned al-Bāqir on account of the two different answers he gave them on two different occasions.[2] Other followers of his such as Mughīra b. Sa^{c}id al-ʿIjlī, Bayān b. Sim^{c}ān and Abū Manṣūr al-Ijlī were repudiated by al-Bāqir on account of their extremist views.[3]

There are many associates of al-Bāqir listed in the Shī^{c}ite sources but it is not always easy to determine where these people lived and also whether they were intimately involved with al-Bāqir. In some cases sources mention that the person mentioned belonged to such and such a school. For instance Ibn Dāwūd mentions Salim b. Abī Hafsa[4] as being Zaydī (Batrīya) and that he invented lies against the Imam.

This section cannot be comprehensive but it gives a picture of a wide and knowledgeable circle of

---

1. Madelung, Der Qāsim pp. 44ff.
2. Nawbakhti, Firaq, p. 52-55
3. See 'Al-Bāqir and the Ghulāt' in Chapter three of the thesis.
4. Rijāl, p.455.

adherents. The sources do not give us a clear idea of the organization of al-Bāqir's Shīᶜa at that time yet it is nonetheless clear that there was some rudimentary organization system existing so that al-Bāqir could communicate with his Shīᶜa and they with him.

CHAPTER SEVEN

AL-BĀQIR'S CONTRIBUTION TO FIQH

(a) Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt

Al-Bāqir's juridical views appear to spring directly from his epistemology or theory of knowledge. Since he believed that the Imam was endowed with the hereditary ᶜIlm which made him an exclusive source of knowledge, he and his followers maintained that 'true knowledge' was restricted only to the Imam from among the Prophet's family. Thus the whole tradition of the community was not valid as a proper source for law; only the traditions from the Imam or the traditions from the Prophet as attested by the Imams were allowed. It was this attitude of al-Bāqir's school towards the majority of the early community of the Prophet's Companions that changed the legal pattern of the Shīᶜa in the years to come. The basis of Shīᶜa law and theology was to emerge from this attitude and was left to develop itself within the circle of al-Bāqir's

adherents.[1]

Shī^{c}ite sources record an appropriate statement according to which Ja^{c}far al-Ṣādiq said:-

> "...Before Abū Ja^{c}far, i.e. al-Bāqir, the Shī^{c}a did not know the rites of the the pilgrimage and what was permitted (ḥalāl) to them and what was forbidden (ḥarām) to them. But Abū Ja^{c}far opened these up to them and explained the rites of the pilgrimage and what was permitted and what was forbidden. Thus the people came to have need of them i.e. Shī^{c}a, whereas before they had had need of the people."[2]

This statement indicates that until the time of al-Bāqir, the Shī^{c}ites followed the same principles as everyone else in Mecca, Medina, Kūfa and other places. It must be added however, that at the time, the division of the community was not yet deep enough and many Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth were sympathisers and supporters of the Shī^{c}ite cause although they never regarded

---

1. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen. (Berlin, 1965) p. 44. I would like to gratefully acknowledge Howard's help in translating the relevant portions of Madelung's work.

2. Al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī, 2nd edition (Tehran 1388-9 A.H.) II, p.20. This tradition is also reported by al-Kashshī Ma^{c}rifat al Rijāl (Mashshad 1348 A.H.) p. 425 in a slightly abbreviated form.

themselves as specifically Shīᶜa. During that period one of the determining factors was the positive-negative attitude towards the first two caliphs and the harsh - lenient attitude towards ᶜUthmān. However, the reason for the establishment of the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt does not appear to be so much in the above attitude as in the sphere of religious practice.

This was the time when the traditionists were attempting to construct total systems of the pious life. Consequently, there were conflicting opinions and discussions over points of law within the early schools of law. It is worth noting that law in Islam does not only consist of a proper legal system but also of ordinances regarding cult and ritual; it thus is an all-embracing body of religious duties. Amidst the polemical discussions of so many legal scholars, it became paramount for the followers of the Imam to have the right guidance.

The situation in which ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-ᶜĀbidīn[1] found himself in after Karbalā' led him to

---

1. We know from early well-known writers that Imam Zayn-al-ᶜĀbidīn was one of the most outstanding and distinguished scholars of his period. See al-Tabarī, Ta'rīkh, vol. 7, p. 496; Ibn Saᶜd, vol. 5 (Leiden 1905), pp. 156-164; Muslim b. al Hajjāj in his Rijāl Urwa b. al Zubayr mentions ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn's name as being one of those who taught privately at home. Among scholars who attended his classes were Zuhrī, see f. 3-5a in the above work apud Hafiz op. cit. p.26. This manuscript is in the Zahirīya Library, Damascus, collection No. 55, (139-146).

avoid active political life and lead a dedicated religious life. Sources mention that he was one of the most prominent jurists of the time, held in respect and visited by the famous lawyers (fuqahā') and scholars (ulamā') of Medina and elsewhere.[1] On the other hand, al-Bāqir's epoch proved to be far more congenial as well as conducive for undertaking the systematic teaching of law to his followers. The ruling authorities appeared less hostile to the religious activities as long as they did not impinge upon political authorities.

In contrast to the ancient schools of law who accepted the common doctrine of the community, the

---

1. al-Tabarī Ta'rikh Vol. 7, p. 496. See also Ibn Sa^{c}d V, p. 164, who says:-

مات علی بن حسین بالمدینة ودفن
بالبقیع سنة اربع وسبعین وکان یقال
لهذه السنة سنة الفقهاء لکثرة من
مات منهم فیها .

کان علي بن حسین ثقة مأمونا
کثیر الحدیث عالیا رفیعا ورعًا .

Traditionists maintained that the authority of traditions (ḥadīth) from the Prophet superseded that of the community. Al-Bāqir and his followers went even further and rejected the whole tradition of the community completely; they only allowed the traditions from the Imam and from the Prophet's family as attested by the Imam as a proper source of law. Consequently, al-Bāqir's legal theory became utterly different from that of the traditionists. He thus laid the foundation of a separate school - the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt.

Another significant contribution of al-Bāqir's school to general Islamic law was that, like the Traditionists, al-Bāqir and his followers[1] disliked all 'human reasoning' and 'personal opinion' which had become an integral part of the living tradition of the ancient schools.[2]

---

1. Al-Saffār, Muhammad b. al-Husayn (d.290 A.H.) Baṣa^{c}ir al-Darajāt, Vol. II, 299. See also Vol. I, p.299, Vol IV and VI, p.300. This reference is quoted from al-Askarī's Muqaddimat Mirāt al^{c}Uqūl Vol. II (Teheran 1938) pp. 54-7. Also see al-Kulaynī Kāfī I p.58.

2. Schacht, Intro. p.34

In the light of the above discussion then, Schacht's[1] outline of the development of Shī^{c}a law seems scarcely defensible for he would have us believe that the origins of Shī^{c}a law are late and that their early works are apocryphal. Undoubtedly it is difficult to prove all that has come to us from al-Bāqir as authentic. Even if certain traditions from him are spurious, it should not lead us to assume that his entire tradition is fictitious.[2] Living at the time when the legal theory was dominated by the struggle between two concepts[3]: that of the common doctrine of the community and that of the authority of the traditions from the Prophet, it seems impossible that a personality as popular as al-Bāqir's (at least in the field of knowledge) would not have somehow been involved in these discussions. The vast corpus of traditions which al-Bāqir's (and his son's) followers pass on are a clear testimony to that; these traditions must, as are those of the Sunnīs, be parallel to the braod development of the school for, in essence they all go back to the period. The schools of law, thus,

---

1. Schacht, Origins, pp.262ff.
2. Madelung, Der Imam al-Qāsim p.46
3. Schacht, Origins p.137.

have clearly developed alongside each other.[1]

On the one hand Schacht maintains that the division of the community was not yet deep enough to exclude the mutual influence of schools of law while, on the other hand he goes on to conclude that legal maxims that were not exclusively Shīᶜite could not generally be valid as firm Shīᶜite law. Rather, this explains itself says Madelung[2], the difference in the law, at all events from the Sunnī side, had not yet been exaggerated into a question of belief. This happened during the third century under the growing influence of the Ahl al-Sunna wa al Jamāᶜā, representing on the one hand a strictly anti-Shiᶜite tendency and on the other a hostility to disagreement (Ikhtilāf) in questions of law which the older law schools had largely accepted.[3] Therefore, in Madelung's view, it was then possible for a question like maṣh ᶜalā al-khuffayn, rubbing the shoe or sock in ritual ablution, to be considered as a question of

---

1. Madelung, op.cit. p. 46.
2. Der Imām al-Qāsim p.47.
3. Schacht quoting Shafīᶜī Origins, p.95

belief, not because the Shīᶜa had belatedly made it their own. Consequently, it is hardly fair for Schacht to state that the Zaydīya were the first Shīᶜite sect to secede from the Sunnī community.[1]

The Zaydīya, as mentioned previously were doctrinally divided into two main groups: the Batrīya and the Jārūdīya. As far as evidences show, the Jārūdīya were originally supporters of al-Bāqir[2] and their beliefs which are fundamentally different from those of the Batrīya clearly depict traces of al-Bāqir's school. The Jārūdīya took parts of the legal theory of al-Bāqir's school and then added their own requirements to it. For instance, like al-Bāqir's school they maintained that 'true knowledge' was confined to the Prophet's family but then according to the Zaydī belief that anyone from among the sons of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn could 'rise in rebellion' they believed that true knowledge could also be obtained from anyone of the descendants of Ḥasan and

---

1. Schacht, Origins, p.267.
2. See Chapter three.

Husayn.[1]

The Majmūᶜ al-Fiqh[2] has been regarded by many scholars as the oldest attempt at a codification of Islamic Law and Goldziher[3] says that if it were a direct product of Zayd b. ᶜAlī's circle then the priority of the Shīᶜite branch of Islam in fiqh literature that has survived would have to be recognized. Sources[4] indicate that, although the Batriya tendency was clearly dominant in the beginning yet it was the doctrine of the 'stronger' Jārūdīya that had won eventually under the Zaydis. Their doctrine, as mentioned earlier on had been taken over from al-Bāqir's school. The writings on the

---

1. See the tradition of Ibn Daᶜi that the Fuḍayl b. Rassān and Abū Khālid al-Wāsitī claimed that every descendant of al-Hasan and Husayn resembled the Prophet in their knowledge, before they learnt anything and while they were still in their napkins. (Tabsirāt al-ᶜAwwām, p. 186). Apud, Madelung op. cit. p.48.

2. E. Griffini has published from the South Arabian treasures of the Ambrosian Library in Milan, a compendium of fiqh attributed to the founder of the Shīᶜite sect of Zaydīya entitled Majmūᶜ al-fiqh of Zayd. b. ᶜAlī (d. 122/740) under the title Corpus Juris di Zayd ibn ᶜAlī, Milan 1919.

3. Article on 'fiqh' in SEI p. 104.

4. Madelung, op. cit. p. 50.

Imamate in Zaydī literature too are clearly Jārūdīte.[1] They tend to regard the Imamate of Abū Bakr and ᶜUmar as illegitimate. The Risāla ᶜan Zayd fī Ithbāt waṣīyat Amir al-Mu'minīn[2] also seeks to demonstrate the illegitimacy of the first caliphs. Another work, the Kitāb al-Safwa[3] attributed to Zayd is also Jārūdīte in its view where the author laments the dissension in Muḥammad's community and wants to demonstrate that in order to be saved everyone ought to obey the relatives of the Prophet's family for they are the ones who have preserved the Qur'ān, know its proper reading and interpretation and it is they who can give orders and prohibitions according to the Prophet.

As regards the contents of Majmuᶜal-fiqh, it is essentially to be considered as the work of Abū Khālid

---

1. Madelung, op. cit. p. 53.

2. Strothmann Islam XIII No. 8 cited by Madelung, op. cit. p. 53.

3. M.S. British Museum, Or. 3877 f. 72a cited by Madelung p.54. In his view inclusion of the tradition attributed to Zayd implying that God's commands were just as valid for the Prophet's family is clearly directed against the Imamites who raise the Imam above the law.

al-Wāsitī, the Jārūdīte.[1] Strothmann and Bergstrasser have already proved that the Corpus Juris owes to Zayd not much more than his name. A large portion of this corpus is included in the Amālī of Aḥmad b. ᶜĪsa[2] which contains numerous traditions of al-Bāqir reported from Abū al-Jārūd. These include traditions on a wide range of subjects both ʿIbādāt and Muᶜamalāt such such as divorce, drinking of nabīdh, saying "the Bismillah" loudly, inclusion of ḥayyaᶜalā khayr al-ᶜamal, in the call to prayer, the pilgrimage rites, the maṣh ᶜalā al-khuffayn and other individual cases. This shows the dependence of Zaydī law on al-Baqir. Thus Shīᶜa law has in al-Bāqir an earlier root than that of the Zaydīya in as much as it does not derive itself from him.[3] Therefore it was al-Bāqir who established the Madhhab (or the legal school) of the Ahl al-Bayt.

Moreover if, as Goldziher puts it, the priority

---

1. Madelung, op. cit. p.54. See Howard, Imami Shīᶜī Ritual, p.324 for a different view.

2. Griffini Corpus introduction CLXXIII cited by Madelung see the details of the discussion about the corpus in Madelung op. cit. p.54.

3. Madelung, p.47

of fiqh literature of the Zaydīs has to be recognized then in the light of the above discussion the priority of al-Bāqir's contribution to fiqh has to be recognised even more although there is no specific book on fiqh by al-Baqir.

Al-Baqir's role in fiqh does not seem an over exaggeration for not only does Zaydī law appear to have derived from him but Ismāᶜīlī law[1] and Ithnā ᶜAsharī law[2] both record numerous traditions on fiqh from him and regard him as the father of fiqh. It is

---

1. Daᶜā'im al Islam of Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān and especially his K. al Iḍāḥ contain numerous traditions of al-Baqir. This manuscript was kindly lent to me by Prof. Madelung to whom I am indebted.

2. The bulk of traditions in Kulayni's al-Kāfī are from al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq.

interesting to note that Zaydī law that was finally compiled in Yemen, Ismāᶜīlī law in Egypt and Ithnā ᶜAsharī law in Baghdad and Qumm all stem from this one personality and as such there seems little room for doubting his said role.

(b) <u>Some legal problems common to the three Shīᶜite groups - the Zaydīya, the Ithnā ᶜAsharīya and the Ismāᶜīlīya</u>.

The traditions that have come down to us from al-Bāqir suggest that he was more concerned with <u>furūᶜ al-fiqh</u> rather than <u>uṣūl al-fiqh</u>. Al-Bāqir's school was not in favour of other methods used by some of the scholars during his time - principles such as <u>ra'y</u> (individual opinion) and <u>qiyās</u> (analogy). Later this breach of legal learning i.e. <u>uṣūl al-fiqh</u> was developed even further and general Islamic law came to be based on four principles or "roots" (uṣūl pl. of

aṣl): the Qur'ān, the Sunna of the Prophet from recognised traditions, the consensus (Ijmāᶜ) of the scholars of the community and the method of reasoning by analogy (qiyās). The last two have little relevance in al-Bāqir's school for it is the Imam who is looked to in case of any gaps in the tradition or in case of any problem that arises in the community.[1] Indirectly this also indicates the necessity of the Imam of the time not only at one given time but in all times to come in all changing circumstances thus showing that the Qur'ān and Sunna on its own were not enough as sources of law but needed a "true interpreter" which could only be found in the Imam of the time.

For the sake of brevity, not all that has been related from al-Bāqir can or will be dealt with but certain selections will be made in order to demonstrate his concern with furuᶜ al-fiqh. An attempt will be made in the following

---

1. This has not been possible for the Zaydis and Ithnā ᶜAsharīs. The latter, after their twelfth Imam's occultation, have had to develop their own roots/principles of law. So in reality it is only the Ismāᶜīlis who enjoy this privelege of looking to the Imam. (See Coulson, History of Islamic law). Qāḍī al-Nuᶜman in his Ikhtilāf uṣūl al-madhāhib ed. by M. Ghālib (Beirut, 1973) p.51 gives madhāhib al-a'imma as a third source besides Qur'ān and Sunna of the Prophet.

pages to deal with the main features of the legal problem that are mostly common to all the three Shīᶜite groups with a brief discussion to show that these legal points belong to the early period contrary to the statements of some scholars and that these were being taught and expounded by al-Bāqir at the time when other jurists in the early schools of law were discussing and arguing over them.

(i) Masḥ ᶜalā al-Khuffayn

A tradition from Abū Ishāq al-Sabīᶜī (d.128/9) in Shīᶜite works[1] suggests that until al-Bāqir forbade them people used to wipe/moisten their socks/sandals in ritual ablution (masḥ ᶜalā al-Khuffayn) under certain circumstances instead of washing their feet. As pointed out earlier Schacht[2] suggested that this only later became a distinctive point of difference between the Shīᶜites who rejected it and the Sunnis who in opposition to them considered it as valid. However,

---

1. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Sharḥ al Akhbār f. 68 see also Daᶜā'im p. 133; al-Murādī, Amāli Ahmad b. ʿĪsa f. 234a al-Mufīd, K. al Irshād (trans. by Howard) p. 396; al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī Vol. III p. 30.

2. Origins, p.263

there is enough evidence to suggest that the mash was a controversial issue among the scholars and jurists long before the sectarian barriers became firmly established. The dispute revolves around the interpretation of the last line of the Qur'ānic ayat on wuḍū':

> "O Ye who believe, when you arise to pray, wash your faces and your arms to the elbows and wipe your heads and your feet to the ankles"[1]

(wa-'msaḥū bi-ru'ūsikum wa arjulikum, arjulikum according to the Shī^{c}īs and therefore dependent on the preposition bi while the Sunnis read arjulakum which then becomes the object of the verb aghsilū "wash").

Al-Ṭabarī in his Tafsīr[2] has preserved traditions

---

1. Qur'ān V:6 There are many points (e.g. elbows-to or from, extent of the face, wetting the beard etc.) in this āya that became a subject of disputes but we shall be dealing with the mash as it happened to be the area where the greatest dispute occurred.

2. al-Ṭabarī Tafsīr (new ed.) Vol. X p. 58 ff.

on both these readings from early scholars which points to the fact that the issue was indeed argued over early in Islam. This also shows that the Shīᶜite view was held by some scholars at the very beginning of the development of Islamic jurisprudence.

Schacht[1] maintains that the prohibition of the practice of the <u>masḥ</u> by the Shīᶜa is late, for no mention of it is made in the Sunni creed of the second century[2] but then says that the Sunnis themselves were not too sure of the <u>masḥ</u> thus defeating his own argument. Basing his claim on al-Shāfīᶜī's discussion of <u>masḥ</u>[3], Schacht then goes on to assert that the discussion about the <u>masḥ</u> started between the Traditionists and the ancient schools in Medina, not between the Shīᶜites and the Sunnīs. Yet what has come down to us of al-Bāqir's traditions from all three Shīᶜite sources <u>Zaydī</u>[4], <u>Ismāᶜīlī</u>[5] and

---

1. <u>Origins</u> p. 263

2. Abū Ḥanīfa does not mention it in his <u>Fiqh Akbar</u> while mentioning other points of difference from the Shīᶜites.

3. <u>Origins</u> p. 263-4

4. al-Murādī, <u>Amālī Aḥmad b. ᶜĪsā</u> f.234

5. al-Qāḍī al-Nucmān, <u>Sharḥ al-Akhbār</u> f.68; <u>Daᶜāᵓim</u> II p.133.

Ithnā^cAshari[1], seems to maintain that the Shi^cite prohibition of mash goes back to the time of al-Baqir.

(ii) Nabīdh

This was another area where al-Bāqir's school differed from the Kufan jurists. Nabīdh is a comprehensive designation used for all intoxicating drinks, several varieties of which were known and produced in early Arabia, such as mizr from barley, bit^c from honey and faḍīkh from different kinds of dates.[2] It is believed that as grapes were scarce in Arabia, 'wine' was usually prepared from varieties of dates and only exceptionally from grapes.[3] The question was whether the prohibition of wine included that of intoxicating drinks. The difficulty in this matter arose because people were accustomed to preparations of all kinds

---

1. al-Kulayni al-Kāfī III, p.32

2. See art on "nabīdh" in SEI by A.J. Wensinck, p.428 where references are given for these different varieties.

3. Ibid.

of dates, from raisins and other fruits, drinks which only became inebriating if they were preserved a long time and probably also if they were prepared by special methods.[1] Therefore it was difficult to determine the line of demarcation between the allowed and the prohibited kind.

Al-Bāqir was known to have prohibited all intoxicating drinks (muskir)[2] including nabīdh[3]. He did allow fresh fruit juices that had been kept for a day and a night on condition that it had not become intoxicating for then, even a little of it was forbidden.[4] All three schools of the Shīᶜa as well as the three of the four Sunnī ones prohibit the use of nabīdh. The Ḥanafis, on the other hand, allow it with some moderation.

---

1. For more details see arts on "Khamr" in EI^2 and also in SEI by A.J. Wensinck.

2. Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im al Islam II p. 130.

3. al-Murādī Amālī f. 224b; al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī III p.32. The tradition in the Amālī is from al-Bāqir's son al-Ṣādiq.

4. al-Qāḍī Daᶜā'im II p. 126

Although the tradition prohibiting nabīdh is to be found in Zaydī sources, yet Zayd himself has been accused of drinking nabīdh by Ithnā'Asharī writers.[1] It is believed that a man once approached al-Bāqir asking him what was his opinion regarding nabīdh for he had seen Zayd drinking it. To this al-Bāqir is said to have replied that he was not ready to believe that Zayd would drink it but then even if he did, he was neither a Prophet nor a trustee of the Prophet and therefore he may sometimes be right and sometimes wrong. It is quite likely that this tradition may have no basis, considering the enmity between Zayd and al-Bāqir.

(iii) Al-Jahr bi-bismillāh

Shī'ite sources of all three origins normally tend to mention the mash and the nabīdh together in a tradition of al-Bāqir along with one other aspect (that does not seem to be common among them.) But the

---

1. Al-Kashshī Rijāl p. 232. This, however seems to be the usual smear between religious rivals. Ismā'īl is also accused of drinking wine by Ithnā'Asharī sources.

Zaydī[1] and the Ismāᶜīlī[2] sources mention the third point as being al-Jahr bi-bismillāh al-Raḥmān al-Raḥīm "i.e. saying the Bismillāh al-Raḥmān al-Raḥīm loudly as opposed to others who only whisper it[3] while the Ithnaᶜashari[4] record the third point as being mutᶜat al-ḥajj. However the Ithnaᶜasharis, although not mentioning the Bismillāh al-Raḥmān al-Raḥīm with the nabīdh and masḥ, yet are not opposed to it. They too believe that the Bismillah al-Raḥīm should be recited loudly[5] but to them it does not appear to be as important as to the Zaydīs and to the Ismāᶜīlīs who consider it to be among the three things in which Taqīya cannot be observed as can be seen from the following tradition of al-Bāqir's

---

1. al-Murādī, op. cit. f. 224b.

2. al-Qāḍī K. al-Īḍāḥ f. 117 a b., 118 b. See also Daᶜā'im p. 193 where the tradition is from al-Ṣādiq.

3. Mālik, Muwaṭṭā' I p. 81 says not to say it loudly.

4. al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī III p. 32

5. al-Kulaynī, al-Kāfī III p. 313.

son, al-Ṣādiq[1]

التقية ديني ودين آبائي
الا في ثلاث، في شرب المسكر
والمسح على الخفين وترك الجهر
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم •

On the other side, the Zaydīs and the Ismāᶜīlīs not only do not mention the mutᶜat al-ḥajj as one of the three things not bound by Taqīya but they oppose it completely although the Zaydī sect of the Jārūdīya are said to have permitted it.[2]

---

1. al-Qāḍī, Daᶜā'im i p. 133, 193. al-Qāḍī p. 193 mentions a tradition which has been reported on the authority of the Messenger, ᶜAlī, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, ᶜAlī Zayn al ᶜĀbidīn, Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Jaᶜfar al-Ṣadiq saying that all of them used to say the Bismillāh loudly in Sūra al-Fatiha and at the beginning of the Sūra in each rukuᶜ. ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥusayn said that all the children of Fāṭima are agreed in that.

2. See art. on Mutᶜa by W. Heffening p. 418-420 in SEI where further references are given to this. Also see Howard I.K.A. "Mutᶜa marriage reconsidered in the context of the formal procedures for Islamic marriage", Journal of Semitic Studies, vol. 20 (Spring, 1975) pp. 82-92 who feels that because the Jarudiya were formerly supporters of al-Bāqir, this could mean that he did actually hold the doctrine.

(iv) Mut^{c}at al-Ḥajj

Another name for this is tamattu^{c} which is one of the three types o f pilgrimages, the other two being qirān which involves combining the umra and ḥajj and the ifrād that prescribes the full rites of the ḥajj to be performed quite separate from the ^{c}umra[1]. The tamattu^{c} form of the pilgrimage emphasizes a separation between the ^{c}umra and the ḥajj but within the same visit. In this type the pilgrim, after having performed the opening rites, makes a minor sacrifice of hair (taqṣīr - trimming of hair) and leaves the state of consecration (iḥrām)[2] until the time he resumes the rites of the ḥajj. During this period he is not bound b y any of the restrictions of iḥrām and he enjoys normal life which includes sexual relations as well.

---

1. For more details see Howard Imāmi Shī'ī Ritual in the context of early Islamic Jurisprudence (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1975) pp. 79-91.

2. Ibid pp. 30 ff.

The problem in this context arose because the tamattu^{c} form of pilgrimage could involve the other mut^{c}a, mut^{c}at al-nisā' for the pilgrim who performed the ^{c}umra as early as the month of Shawwal or Dhu-al Qa^{c}da would resume normal life until the time of ḥajj. During this time, if he happened to be away from his family, he would perhaps contract a temporary marriage which is concluded for a fixed term, at the end of which it is dissolved automatically.

This kind of marriage is of special interest as it happens to be one of the main areas of controversy not only between the Sunnīs and Ithnā ^{c}Asharī Shī^{c}a but also between the latter and the Zaydī and Ismā^{c}īlī Shī^{c}ī. The Quranic verse[1] that is generally supposed to embody the sanction of the mut^{c}a marriage in the standard version is:-

---

1. Qur'an IV : 24

"and all (women) besides these are made lawful for you, probided that you seek (them) with your property marrying (them) without committing fornication, then as to those by (marrying) whom you seek content (famā istamtaᶜtum bihi minhunna), pay them their rewards as a duty, and there is no blame on you about what you mutually agree after that which is stipulated."

In this version, the above verse does not seem to sanction mutᶜa in any way unless one is to understand "mutᶜa" by the word "istimtā". However, Ibn ᶜAbbās, Ibn Masᶜūd and Ubay[1] read the phrase "ila ajalin musamā (upto a fixed period) after the words "famā istamtaᶜtum bihi minhunna", a reading which supports the view that mutᶜa was sanctioned in the Qur'ān.[2] On the other hand, it is quite possible that this type of marriage was not sanctioned, but was conceded by the Prophet as a matter of expediency. For, it is significant to note that the bulk of his traditions referring to mutᶜa are about the pilgrimage or campaigns.[3] According to various traditions, the Prophet subsequently prohibited

---

1. Jeffery, A., Materials for the History of the text of the Qur'ān, 1937 pp. 36, 126, 197.

2. V.M. Daudpota and A.A.A. Fyzee, "Notes on Mutᶜa or temporary marriage in Islam" JBBRAS (Bombay, 1932) 8 p. 83.

3. See art on "Mutᶜa" in EI[1] by Heffening.

it[1], thus supporting the belief that like wine, this practice was gradually abolished.

However, the Ithnā ᶜAsharī Shīᶜa regard <u>mutᶜa</u> marriage as valid up to the present day. They maintain that a divinely revealed institution could not be abrogated except by a divine revelation or by the Commandment of an Infallible (<u>maᶜṣūm</u>) Imam. They further assert that the sanction of <u>mutᶜa</u> has also been given by their Imams.[2]

What is significant here is that the traditions found in the three Shīᶜite sources of Zaydī, Ismāᶜīlī and Ithnā ᶜAsharī origin appear to be contradictory in this particular case. The traditions are handed down by the same Imams, al-Bāqir and his son al-Ṣādiq

---

1. Muslim <u>Ṣaḥīḥ</u> Vol. 9 p. 184-185; Zayd, <u>Majmūᶜ</u> pp. 328-9; al-Qāḍī <u>Mukhtaṣar al-Athār</u> vol II p. 248 - for details see Daudpota and Fyzee "Notes on Mutᶜa ...." <u>op. cit.</u> pp. 87 ff. Also ref. al-Qāḍī's <u>Daᶜā'im</u> vol II pp. 216, 226.

2. al-Kulaynī <u>al-Kāfī</u> III p. 32 where <u>mutᶜat al-hajj</u> is mentioned along with <u>maṣh</u> and <u>nabīdh</u>. Also see his vol IV p. 291 and al-Ṭūsi's <u>Nihāya</u> p. 206. The bulk of their traditions go back in fact only to two Imams, al-Bāqir and his son al-Ṣādiq.

in all three sources. Ithnā ᶜAsharī writers like to believe that the traditions in Zaydī and Ismāᶜīlī[1] sources are a later fabrication[2] but this can be considered a mere assumption on their part as the core of the traditions in all three sources go back to the same period.

(v) The Adhān or Call to the ritual prayer

This is another matter of dispute between the Shīᶜīs and the Sunnis. But unlike the mutᶜa, the Shīᶜīs of all three origins are agreed on the view that ᶜUmar had tampered with the formula of the adhān and caused one of the formulas to be dropped.[3] This

---

1. It is interesting to note that in this respect Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān relied on Zaydī tradition and disregarded the Imamī sources on which he generally relied. See Madelung's art. "The Sources of Ismāᶜīlī Law" JNES 35 (1976) pp.32-3.

2. al-ᶜAmīlī, Sayyid ᶜAbd al Husayn Sharaf al-dīn, Al-Fuṣul al-Muhimma (Saida 1374 A.H.) p.59 apud U.M. Daudpota and A.A.A. Fyzee "Notes on Mutᶜa op. cit. p.82. Also see Howard I.K.A., Imami Shīᶜī Rituals p. 32 and "Mutᶜa marriage reconsidered...." Journal of Semitic Studies vol. 20 No. 2 (1975) 82-92.

3. al-Qāḍī K. al Īḍāḥ f 41 b; Also see his Daᶜā'im p. 182, al-Murādī Amali f. 24 b; al Faḍl b. Shādhān, al-Īḍāḥ pp. 201-202.

formula, the Shi^{c}a assert was <u>ḥayya ^{c}alā Khayr al-^{c}amal</u>[1] but ^{c}Umar, fearing that people would give preference to prayers than <u>jihād</u> gave such orders as to have that formula removed.

As this is a serious allegation, it calls for a brief discussion as to whether this formula did belong to the <u>adhān</u> at an early period or whether the Shī^{c}a had conjectured the whole thing and made it belatedly their own. The early jurists and the traditionists have passed over in silence on this issue and therefore it would seem as though the Shi^{c}a have imagined the whole thing up. However, some evidence regarding it has been preserved in Shaybānī's recension of Mālik's <u>Muwaṭṭā'</u>[2] giving us an indication that the formula did belong to the <u>adhān</u> at a much earlier

---

1. al-Qāḍī <u>k. al Īḍāḥ</u> f. 44 b; Da^{c}ā'im I p. 172 al-Murādī <u>op. cit.</u> al-Faḍl b. Shādhān <u>op. cit.</u> The full formula for the Shi^{c}a <u>adhān</u> would thus run as follows: (i) Allahu Akbar (ii) Ashhadu an la ilāh illa Allah (iii) Ashhadu anna Muḥammadan Rasūl Allāh (iv) Hayya ^{c}ala al-ṣalat (v) Ḥayya ^{c}ala'al-falāḥ (vi) Ḥayya ^{c}alā Khayr al-^{c}amal (vii) Allahu akbar (viii) La ilah illā'Allāh. The Sunni <u>adhān</u> does not have number (vi) See Th. W. Juynboll <u>art.</u> <u>adhān</u> EI^{2}

2. al-Muwaṭṭā'- recension of al-Shaybānī (Cairo, 1976) p. 55

period. The tradition recorded by Shaybānī which has a standard Medinan isnād (Mālik - Nāfi - Ibn ᶜUmar) says that Ibn ᶜUmar sometimes used to recite ḥayya ᶜalā khayr al-ᶜamal after ḥayya ᶜalā al-falāḥ. One may perhaps doubt the authenticity of such a tradition; but in this case there is hardly any room for doubt as it is used for a practice that was no longer in use.[1] It must be noted however that Shaybānī rejects this practice saying that nothing that did not belong to the adhān should be added to it. Yet, it is significant that this tradition is not to be found in Yaḥyā b. Yaḥyā al-Laythī's recension of the Muwaṭṭā'[2] and in fact seems to have been submerged by all Sunni sources until it reappears in Ibn Hazm[3] who also rejects it as a fabrication.

Shīᶜite sources of all three origins record traditions from al-Bāqir[4] saying that the formula was

---

1. Howard, I.K.A. "The development of the Adhān and Iqāma of the Ṣalāt in Early Islam", Journal of Semitic Studies, vol. 26, No. 2 (1981) Also see his thesis, Imama Shīᶜī Ritual p. 266

2. Mālik b. Anas al-Muwaṭṭa' (recension of Yahyā b. Yaḥyā al-Layth). Beriut 1955

3. Ibn Hazm, K. al Muḥallā (Cairo, 1351 A.H.) iii, 161.

4. al-Qāḍī - K. al Īḍāḥ f. 41b, 44b; Daᶜā'im p. 182 al-Murādī - Amālī f 24-25; al-Faḍl b. Shādhān, al-Īḍāḥ p. 201-202;

originally there but was later removed by ᶜUmar. Since all the three sources independently support the fact that al-Baqir did make this statement and since the tradition regarding it has been mentioned in Shaybānī's recension of Mālik's Muwaṭṭā', it seems quite likely that the formula did in fact belong to the early period and it is also possible that it may have been removed during ᶜUmar's caliphate. However, if we are to accept the suggestion that as the form of the adhān had not been fixed, the formula of ḥayya ᶜala khayr al ᶜamal may have been added to by the Ahl al Bayt after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn to emphasize the quiescent policy of the Imams[1] then we shall have to retract the former conclusion about the possibility of the formula being removed during ᶜUmar's time. For, the martyrdom of Ḥusayn comes much later after ᶜUmar's time so how could the formula be removed during his time when it was introduced afterwards? In that case either one has to forget that ᶜUmar ever tampered with the

---

1. Howard, Imami Shīᶜī Ritual, pp. 266-277.

adhān or have to maintain that the Imams reintroduced (instead of introduced) this barred formula after Ḥusayn's martyrdom.

(vi) Qunūt

The term qunūt which came to mean imprecation against political enemies during ritual prayer, may originally not have meant that. For the Qur'ānic phrase wa qūmū li'llāhī qānitin[1] which follows the words "Keep the ṣalawāt and the ṣalāt al wusta" does not seem to indicate that meaning literally and commentators have suggested its meaning to be either a state of submission or supplication[2]. Al-Ṭabarī[3] also gives no suggestion that qunūt means "cursing enemies" and neither does the Lisān al ᶜArab[4]. Most commentators of the

---

1. II: 238

2. Supplication may include cursing although not necessarily see SEI p. 271 art. Ḳunūt by A.J. Wensinck saying there is no unanimity among lecicographers about its meaning.

3. Ṭabarī Tafsīr V 228-237 (new edition)

4. Ibn Manẓūr Lisān al-ᶜArab section on

hadīth[1] seem to maintain that qunūt is a standing recitation" usually connected in meaning with duᶜā'. The traditions that have come down to us about qunūt are very conflicting, some favouring it[2], others either rejecting it altogether[3], or restricting it to certain prayers[4]. Yet others state that the prophet had said it only during a certain period and then abandoned it.[5] Except Abu Hanifa who excluded qunūt from all prescribed prayer,[6] others mainly seem to dispute whether the qunūt is allowed in all prayers or restricted to a certain prayer i.e. the ṣalāt al-wusta.

---

1. Muslim, K. al-Iman trad 100; Nawawī, Tirmidhī Ṣalāt bab 168. See for more details the art. on Ḳunūt in SEI by A.J. Wensinck.

2. Shāfiᶜī, K. al-Umm VII 285-7

3. See Schacht Origins pp. 267-8 for more references

4. Abū Yusūf K. al-Athār 69 dislikes qunūt in general but allows it in witr. He includes a tradition from ᶜAlī saying "Praise Allah, bless the Messenger and ask (help) for yourself." This does not specifically imply cursing.

5. Schacht Origins pp. 267-8

6. This tallies with the views of the Murji'ites who endeavoured not to get involved with disputes, about the merits of the Companions. See art. EI "Murji'a" by A.J. Wensinck.

This dispute stems from the interpretation of the above mentioned Qur'ānic verse namely whether qānitīn refers to all the prayers or only to ṣalāt al-wusta. Mālik[1] thinks it is ṣalāt al-wusta which for him is the fajr prayer. Strothmann[2] and Goldziher[3] believe that the Zaydis also followed the Malikis although the traditions in the Amālī Aḥmad b. ᶜIsa[4] from al-Bāqir reported by Abū al-Jārūd does not specify the times of qunūt. Traditions in Ismāᶜīlī sources[5] maintain that the qunūt prayer has many aspects to it showing that there is nothing fixed for qunūt. Thus it can be said at any time in all prayers if one so wishes and it does not necessarily involve cursing. Ithnā ᶜAsharī sources[6] refer qānitīn to all prayers and so does Shāfiᶜī[7].

---

1. Malik Muwaṭṭā' I 159, 139

2. See Howard, Imami Shīᶜī Ritual p. 284 note 205

3. Ibid.

4. The traditions only say that he heard Abū Jaᶜfar (al-Bāqir) saying that the Prophet and ᶜAli used to curse men in qunūt, naming them specifically. See f. 37b.

5. Daᶜā'im I p. 246

6. al-Kāfī III 339-40 and al-Barqī op. cit II p. 324

7. K. al-Umm VII pp. 285-7 has traditions from al-Bāqir and al-Sadiq supporting qunūt in all prayers

(vii) Ṣalāt al Janāza

The funeral prayer is yet another subject of dispute between the Sunnis and the Shīᶜas. The Sunnis maintain it should consist of four takbīrs while the Shīᶜās of all origin say it is five.[1] Both groups claim their final authority to be the Prophet whose practice according to the traditions that have come down to us seems to have varied from time to time as well as from person to person. There are reports[2] maintaining that the Prophet used to either say four or five or six takbīrs. This practice was carried on by the first caliph but was standardized to four takbīrs by the second caliph, ᶜUmar on the basis of the last funeral service performed by the Prophet.[3]

---

1. al-Qāḍī al -Nuᶜmān Daᶜā'im I p.282 Zayd b. ᶜAlī Musnad 167; Al-Kulaynī al-Kāfī III 171.

2. Abū Yusūf in his K. al-Athār p.79 reports a tradition from Ibrāhīm al-Nakhāᶜī. Also see Howard, Imāmī Shīᶜī Ritual p. 172 for more details.

3. ibid. The Zaydīs preserve a similar account without ᶜUmar's search for the last funeral service performed by the Prophet or his conclusion from it.

ᶜAlī is reported to have said up to seven takbīrs.[1]

Mālik[2] and al-Shāfīᶜī[3] both follow the practice of four takbīrs, although elsewhere Shāfīᶜī does record traditions that ᶜAlī had said five or six takbīrs at one funeral[4]. As late as the fifth century, Ibn Hazm[5] records the names of some Companions[6] saying five takbīrs. This shows that the matter wa disputed early in Islam and that the Shīᶜa have not made this doctrine belatedly their own.

These are but few of the legal problems that were being discussed and argued over during the late first and early second centuries of Islam. In his

---

1. Zaydī tradition from Zayd b. ᶜAlī who reports that ᶜAlī used to say four, five, six or seven takbīrs but he himself states that there are five takbīrs. Ibid.

2. Muwaṭṭā' I 226-7, See Howard, Imāmī Shīᶜī Ritual for details on the weakness in Mālik's traditions.

3. K. al-Umm I 239.

4. Ibid I, 251; VII 156

5. Ibn Hazm K. al-Muḥalla V 124

6. Among them were Zayd b. al-Arqam, Ibn Masᶜūd and ᶜAlī.

own group and to others who came to ask his views, al-Bāqir was also giving his own specific views of these and other legal matters as can be seen from the above discussion. Besides the points already discussed, other problems that were being expounded at the time by al-Bāqir and others were the Khiyār al-Majlis (the right of option given to a party in a sale as long as they had not separated), the rites of pilgrimage, the right to sell the umm al-walad and many other points. This makes him the first Imam to systematically undertake the teaching of law to his followers in particular and others in general.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, although al-Bāqir eschewed active political action, he had a significant role to play in history, both from the intellectual point of view as well as from the religious angle. He emerges as a versatile scholar conversant not only in matters of rites and rituals but also on the exegesis of Qur'ān, the traditions of the Prophet, questions pertaining to law as such, as well as theological topics of both mundane and spiritual nature. It is also significant to note that before al-Bāqir's time Shīᶜite learning appeared limited. Then, suddenly in his time, there is a sudden profusion of knowledge on various aspects as seen by the vast number of traditions that have come down from him. This makes him the first Imam of the Shīᶜa from whom such knowledge has been preserved and in fact because of his times he was also the first Imam to engage in systematic teaching.

At the time when al-Bāqir lived, there were many groups who, being dissatisfied with the reigning rulers began denouncing them in different ways - some resorting to political action, some acquiesing and some diverting their energies to religious learning. Among

the dissatisfied were groups of Shīᶜites; many among them publicly denounced the Umayyads and wanted to take immediate political action against them. They placed before the people a hope of a deliverer which they said could only come from the Ahl al-Bayt of the Prophet. This last aspect was exploited by many. Thus the various groups such as Mukhtār and the Kaysānīya in its various branches, the Zaydīya and its sister branches as well as other Alids like al-Ḥasan al-Muthanna propagating for his son, al-Nafs al-Zakīya all had a different concept about the Imam and the Imamate.

In order to bring some sort of order in the chaos that had thus occurred as well as the resulting confused concept of Imamate, al-Bāqir put forward his own theory of Imamate which had Qur'ān and ḥadīth as its bases. He also explained the necessary qualities that an Imam must possess such as naṣṣ, ᶜIlm, Nūr, Iṣma and others that distinguished the Imam from others and made him al-afḍal al-Nās, the best of mankind. In this manner, he declared himself as the representative of God on earth and the divine interpreter of His words. By demonstrating his role in providing true knowledge in this world and in providing intercession in the hereafter, al-Bāqir also proposed a theory of Imamate that was not necessarily rebellious and which therefore did not

depend on political power. This was quite timely as many had come to believe by then that the Imam is not an Imam unless he bids for political power. This theory of al-Bāqir's suited the reigning Umayyads very well who thus left him in peace to pursue the intellectual and religious activities.

This was also the time when the pious were beginning to construct total systems of their life and providing an ethical code for the followers of its precepts. This resulted in varying interpretations given by the various scholars on a variety of questions. Amidst this, evidence shows that al-Bāqir, being an eminent and distinguished scholar of ḥadīth, numerous people came to him for advice regarding many problems as well as about the traditions of the Prophet on which he was considered a reliable authority.

Another area where al-Bāqir played a significant role was in the enhancement of the Prophetic traditions. Just before his time, Sunna used to be considered as the 'custom' of the particular place and many scholars used to give judgements according to the 'custom' of their own particular area rather than according to the traditions of the Prophet. Along

with the 'pious movement', al-Bāqir emphasized the importance of the traditions of the Prophet but whereas the former included the traditions of the whole community, al-Bāqir only accepted traditions of the Prophet as attested by the Imams from the Prophet's family.

The above attitude of al-Bāqir distinguished them from the rest of the community and formed the bases from which Shī^{c}a law and theology emerged. He thus became instrumental in founding a separate school, the Madhhab Ahl al-Bayt having different views on many aspects of fiqh such as masḥ ^{c}alā al-khuffayn, nabīdh, adhān, jarh bībismillah and such other legal problems. Moreover like the Aṣḥāb al-Ḥadīth, al-Bāqir and his school also rejected the use of ra'y (opinion) and qiyās (analogy) when giving judgements on juridical questions. Thus, amidst the varying interpretations given by the different scholars, al-Bāqir's followers were able to seek advice and guidance from him on these various legal matters and this also distinguished them from others.

Al-Baqir also contributed to the theological doctrines concering īmān, taqīya, qaḍa' wa al-qadar, the unity of God as well as a host of other related topics

that were being discussed and hotly debated in his time.

Thus, al-Bāqir emerges not only as a head of a particular group, having founded a separate school and providing a basis for them but he also comes forth as one of the most distinguished scholars of the period disseminating knowledge on all aspects to the general public.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Manuscripts

ᶜAbbād b. Yaᶜqūb — **Kitāb al Aṣl** (Teheran Dānishgāh) No.962/2

ᶜAbdAllāh b. Yaḥya — **Kitāb al-Aṣl** (Teheran Danishgah)No.962/11

ᶜAbd al-Malik b. Hākim — **Kitāb al-Aṣl** (Teheran Danishgah) No.962/7

ᶜAlī b. Asbāṭ. — **Kitāb al-Nawādir** (Teheran Danishgah)No.962/13

ᶜAlī b. Jaᶜfar b.Muḥammad — **al-Masā'il** (Teheran Danishgah) No.506.

ᶜAsim b. Humayd — **Kitāb al-Aṣl** (Teheran Danishgah) No.962/3

al-Ḥusayn b. Saᶜīd — **Kitāb al-Mu'minīn** (Teheran, Danishgah) No.775

al-Ḥusayn b. ᶜUthmān — **Kitāb al-Aṣl** (Teheran Danishgah)No.962/10

Jaᶜfar b. Muḥammad b. Shurayh,	Kitāb al-Aṣl (Teheran Dānishgāh) No.962/
Khallād b. Khalaf	Kitab al-Aṣl (Teheran Dānishgāh) No.962/9
Muḥammad b. al-Muthannā	Kitāb al-Aṣl (Teheran Dānishgāh) No.962/8
al-Murādī	Amālī Aḥmad b. ᶜĪsa H.135 ARABO-BIBLIOTECA Ambrosiana, Milan.
al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān,	al-Manāqib wa al-Mathālib (Ismaᶜili Institute, London)
	Sharh al-akhbār (Ismaᶜili Institute, London) No. A 167.
	K. al-Iḍāḥ (excerpts) (personal copy of Prof. Madelung) Tubingen.
Salām b. ᶜAmra	Kitāb al-Aṣl (Teheran Danishgah)No.962/12
Zayd al-Zarrād	Kitāb al-Aṣl (Teheran Danishgah) No.962/1
Zayd al-Narsi	Kitāb al-Aṣl (Teheran Danishgah) No.962/4

2. General Islamic Works

Abu Dā'ūd, Sulaymān b. al-Ashᶜath,
Sunan Abi Da'ūd, ed. M. ᶜAbd al-Ḥamīd
4 Vols. (Cairo, 1950-51).

Abū al-Faraj al-Isfahānī,
Kitāb al-Aghānī, 20 vols.
(Cairo, 1285 A.H.)

Maqātil al-Ṭālibīyīn
(Teheran 1949).

Abū Nuᶜaym, Aḥmad b. ᶜAbdAllāh al-Iṣfahānī
Hilyat al-Awliya', 10 vols.
(Cairo, 1932-38).

Al-Ashᶜarī, Abū al-Ḥasan ᶜAlī b. Ismāᶜīl,
Maqālat al-Islāmiyyin, ed. H. Ritter,
(Istanbul, 1929).

Al-Ashᶜarī, Muḥammad b. Yahyā b. Abī Bakr,
Al-Tamhid wa al-Bayān fī Maqtal al-Shahīd
ᶜUthmān,
ed. Mahmid Zayid; (Beirut, 1964).

Al-Ashᶜarī Saᶜd b. ᶜAbdAllah al-Qummī,
Kitāb al-Maqālat wa al-Firaq,
ed. M. Jawād Mashkūr; (Tehran, 1963).

Al-Azraqī, Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllah,
Akhbār Makka, ed. Rushdi al-Ṣāliḥ;
(Mecca, 1352 A.H.)

Al-Baghdādī, Abū Manṣūr ᶜAbd al-Qāhir
Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq, ed. al-Kawtharī;
(Cairo, 1948).

Kitāb Uṣūl al-Dīn (Istanbul, 1928)

Al-Balādhurī, Aḥmad b. Yahyā b. Jābir
Ansāb al-Ashrāf, Vol.1
ed. M. Hamidullah; (Cairo, 1955);
Vol. IV A-B, ed. M. Schloessinger, (Jerusalem 1938-1971):
Vol. V, ed. S.D.F. Goitein, (Jerusalem, 1936)

Futūḥ al-Buldān trans. Phillip K. Hitti,
Origins of the Islamic State, (New York, 1916

Al-Bayḍāwī, ᶜAbdAllah b. ᶜUmar,
Anwār al-Tanzīl ed. Fleischer;
(Leipsig : Vogel, 1846-8).

Al-Bayhāqī, Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm
Kitāb al-Mahāsin wa al-Masāwī
ed. F. Schwally; (Giessan, 1902).

Al-Bayhāqī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. al-Ḥusayn
Kitāb al-Sunan al-Kubra, 10 Vols.
(Hyderabad, 1925-1937).

Al-Bukhārī, Muhammad b. Ismāᶜīl
al-Jamīᶜ al-Ṣaḥīḥ,
(Cairo, 1932).

al-Ta'rīkh al-Kabīr, 8 vols.
(Hyderabad, 1358 - 62 A.H.).

al-Ta'rīkh al-Saghīr
(Lucknow, 1325, A.H.)

Al-Damīrī, Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ᶜĪsā,
Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān al-Kubra
(Cairo, Bulaq, 1867).

Al-Daraquṭnī, ᶜAlī b. ᶜUmar
Sunan al-Daraqutnī
(Delhi, 1310 A.H.)

Al-Dārimī ᶜAbdAllāh b. Abd. al-Raḥmān
Sunan al-Dārimī 2 vols.
(Damascus, 1349 A.H.)

Al-Dāwūdī, Muḥammad b. ᶜAli
Ṭabaqāt al-Mufassirīn ed. ᶜAli M. ᶜUmar,
2 vols. (Cairo, 1972).

Al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad
Al-ᶜIbar fī khabar man Ghabar
ed. F. al-Sayyid and S. al-Munajjid,
(Kuwat, 1961).

Mīzān al-Iᶜtidāl fī Naqd al-Rijāl
ed. ᶜAlī Muḥammad al-Bijāurī
(Cairo, 1963)

Siyar Aᶜlam al-Nubalā'
ed. S. al-Munajjid et. al.
(Cairo, 1967).

Ṭabaqāt al-Qurrā'
ed. M. Jad al-Haqq
(Cairo, 1967)

Tadhkirāt al-Ḥuffāz
(Hyderabad, 1333 A.H.)

Tarājim Rijāl Rawā Muhammad b. Ishāq
Ra'īs Ahl al-Maghāzi ᶜAnhum
(Leiden, Brill, 1890)

Ta'rikh al-Islam
ed. al Qadsi, (Cairo, 1948-50)

Al-Dīnawarī, Abū Ḥanīfa Aḥmad b. Dā'ūd
Kitāb Akhbār al-Tiwāl
ed. ᶜAbd al-Mun'im ᶜĀmir and J. al-Shayyāl
(Cairo, 1960)

Farazdaq,
Dīwan
ed. ᶜAbd Allāh Ismaᶜīl al-Sāwī
(Cairo, 1936)

Al-Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad,
Faḍā'iḥ al-Bāṭinīya
ed. with an intr. by A. Badawī
(Cairo, 1964)

Iḥyā' ᶜUlūm al-Dīn 4 vols.
(Cairo, 1929)

Al-Iqtiṣād fī al-Iᶜtiqād
ed. with an intr. by A. Cubukcu and H. Atay
(Ankara, 1962)

Al-Ḥākim al-Nīsābūrī, Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllāh
(d.405 A.H.)

Al-Mādkhāl ilā Maᶜrıfat al-Iklīl
ed. J. Robson under the title. An Introduction to the Science of Tradition
(London, 1953).

Maᶜrifat ᶜUlūm al-Ḥādīth ed.
S.M. Ḥusayn (Beirut n.d.)

al- Mustādrak ᶜalā al-Ṣāḥīḥayn
4 vols. (Beirut n.d.)

Al-Ḥumāydī, ᶜAbdAllah b. al-Zubāyr b. ᶜIsā
(d.210 A.H.)
Musnād al Ḥumāydī
ed. Ḥābib al-Raḥmān al-Aᶜzamī
(Karachī, 1965)

Ibn ᶜAbd al-Barr Yūsuf b. ᶜAbdAllah
Al-Istiᶜab fī Maᶜrifat al-Aṣḥāb
ed. ᶜAli Muhammad al-Bājawi
(Cairo, 1960)

Al-Istidhkār
ed. ᶜAli al-Najdī Nāṣif
(Cairo, 1971)

Jāmiᶜ Bayān al-ᶜĪlm
(Cairo, n.d.)

Ibn ᶜAbd Rabbih, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad
Al-ᶜIqd al-Farīd
ed. Ahmad Amin et al,
(Cairo, 1952-6)

Ibn Abī al-Hadīd
Sharḥ Nahj al Balāgha
ed. Muḥammad A. Ibrāhīm
(Cairo, 1959)

Ibn ᶜAsākir, ᶜAlī b. al-Ḥasan
Al-Ta'rīkh al-Kabir
(Damascus, 1347 A.H.)

TabyIn Kidhb al-Muftarī
(Damascus, 1347 A.H.)

Ta'rīkh Madinat Dimashq
ed. S. al-Munajjid et al
(Damascus, 1951)

Ibn al-Athīr, ᶜIzz al-Dīn ᶜAlī b. Muḥammad
Al-Lubab fi Tahdhīb al-Ansāb
(Baghdad, n.d.)

Usd al-Ghāba fī Maᶜrifat al-Ṣaḥāba
5 vols. (Cairo, 1280-87 A.H.)

Ibn al-Athīr, Abū al-Hasan ᶜAlī b. Karīm
Al-Kāmil fī al-Ta'rikh
(Beirut, 1975)

Al-Nihāya fī Gharīb al-Ḥadīth wa al-Athār
4 vols., (Cairo, 1318 A.H.)

Ibn Bakkār, Abū ᶜAbdAllah al-Zubayr
Jamharat Nasab Quraysh wa Akhbārihā
ed. M.M. Shākir,
(Cairo, 1381 A.H.)

Ibn Hajar al-ᶜAsqalānī, Aḥmad b. ᶜAlī
Fatḥ al-bārī, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī
(Cairo, 1959)

Hādī al-Sārī Muqaddimat Fatḥ al-Bārī
(Cairo, 1964)

Al-Iṣāba fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥāba
Hyderabad, 1328 A.H.)

Lisān al-Mīzān
(Hyderabad, 1329 A.H.)

- Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb
(Hyderabad, 1325-27 A.H.)

- Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb
ed. ᶜAbd al-Wahhāb ᶜAbd al-Latīf
(Cairo, 1960)

Ibn Ḥanbal, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad
Al-'Ilal wa Maᶜrifat al-Rijal
Vol. I, ed. T alᶜat Kocyigit
(Ankara, 1963)

- al-Musnad
ed. A.M. Shakir,
(Cairo, 1949)

Ibn Hazm, Abū ᶜAbdAllah Muḥammad ᶜAlī b. Aḥmad
Al-Faṣl fī al-Milal wa al-Ahwā' wa al-Niḥal
(Cairo, 1347 A.H.)

- Al-Iḥkām fī uṣūl al-Aḥkām
(Cairo, 1926-8)

Jamharat Ansāb al-ᶜArab
ed. A.M. Harun

Ibn Hibbān al-Bustī, Muḥammad
Kitāb al-Majrūhīn min al-Muḥaddithīn
(Hyderabad, 1972).

- Mashāhir ᶜUlamā' al-Amsār
ed. M. Fleischḥammer, Die Beruhmten Tradition Islamischen Lander,
(Cairo, 1952).

Saḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān ed. A.M. Shakīr
(Cairo, 1952)

Ibn Hishām Abū Muḥammad ᶜAbd al-Malik
Sīrat Rasūl Allāh ed. M. Saqqa _et al._
(Cairo, 1936) trans. A. Guillaume, _The Life of Muhammad_
(Oxford, 1967).

Ibn ᶜImād al-Ḥanbalī
Shadharat al-Dhahab fī Akhbār man Dhahab
(Cairo, 1350 A.H.)

Ibn al-Jawzī, Abū al-Faraj, ᶜAbd al-Rahman b. ᶜAlī
Kitab al-Adhkiyā
(Beirut, 1967)

Kitāb Ṣifāt al-Safwa
(Hyderabad, 1355-57).

Sirat ᶜUmar b. ᶜAbd al-ᶜAzīz
ed. M. al-Khatib
(Cairo, 1331 A.H.)

Talbīs Iblīs
(Cairo, 1340 A.H)

Al-Mawḍūᶜāt ed. A.M. ᶜUthmān
Vol. I (Medina, 1966).

Al-Muntazam fī Ta'rīkh al-Mulūk wa al-Umam
Vol. 7 (Hyderabad, 1358 A.H.).

Ibn al-Jazarī, Abū al-Khayr Muḥammad (d.833 A.H.)
Al-Nashr fī al-Qirā'at al-ᶜAshr
(Cairo, n.d.).

Ghāyat al-Nihāya fī Tabaqāt al-Qurrā'
ed. G. Bergstrasser (Cairo, 1933).

Ibn Kathīr, ᶜImād al-Dīn Abū al-Fidā Ismāᶜīl b. ᶜUmar (d. 774A.H.).
Al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya
(Beirut, 1966).

Tafsīr al Qur'ān al-ᶜAzīm
(Cairo, 1971).

Ibn Khālawāyh (d. 370 A.H.).
Mukhtaṣār fi Shawādhdh al-Qur'ān
(Cairo, 1934)

Ibn Khāldun, ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān
Al-ᶜIbār
(Cairo, 1867 -)

Al-Muqaddima trans. by F. Rosenthal and abridged by N.J. Dawood
(London, 1978)

Ibn Khallikān Aḥmad b. Muḥammad
Wafayāt al-Aᶜyān, ed. Ihsān ᶜAbbās;
(Beirut, 1972).

Ibn Khayyāt al-ᶜUsfurī, Khalīfa (d.240 A.H.)
Ta'rīkh Khalīfa Ibn Khayyāt
ed. Suhayl Zakkār
(Damascus, 1968)

K. al-Ṭabaqāt ed. A.D al-ᶜUmar
(Baghdad, 1967).

Ibn Māja Muḥammad b. Yazīd (d. 273 A.H.)
Al-Sunan, ed. M. F. ᶜAbd al-Bāqī
(Cairo, 1952-3).

Ibn Manzūr, Abū al-Faḍl Jamāl al-Dīn (d. 711 A.H)
Lisān al-ᶜArab 20 Vols.
(Cairo, 1300-7 A.H.)

Ibn al-Nadīm, Muḥammad b. Ishāq (d. 385 A.H.)
Al-Fihrist
(Cairo, 1348 A.H.)

Ibn Qutayba Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllah
ᶜUyūn al-Akhbār
(Cairo, 1925-30)

Kitāb al-Maᶜārif
(Cairo, 1300 A.H.)

Ta'wīl Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth
(Cairo, 1326 A.H.).

Ta'wil Mushkil al-Qur'ān; ed. A. Saqr
(Cairo, 1954)

Al-Imāma wa al-Siyāsa (attr.)
(Cairo, 1957).

Ibn Saᶜd, Muḥammad
Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt ed. Sachau et. al.
(Leiden, 1905-1940).

Ṭabāqāt al-Kubra
(Beirut n.d.)

Ṭabāqāt al-Kubra
(Leiden, 1965)

Al-Jāḥiẓ, Abū ᶜUthmān ᶜAmr b. Baḥr (d. 255 A.H.)
Al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn, ed. A.M. Hārūn
4 Vols. (Cairo, 1948-50).

Kitāb al-Ḥayawān ed. A.M. Hārun
5 Vols. 2nd edition (Cairo, 1966).

Rasā'il al-Jāḥiẓ ed. H. al-Sandubī
(Cairo, 1933).

Al-Jahshiyārī Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdūs
Kitāb al-Wuzara' wa al-Kuttāb
(Cairo, 1938).

Al-Jaṣṣās, Aḥmad b. ᶜAlī (d. 370 A.H.)
Aḥkam al-Qur'ān, 3 vols.
(Cairo, 1928).

Al-Jawharī, Abū Naṣr Ismāᶜīl b. Muḥammad
(d. 393 A.H.)
Tāj al-Lugha, 2 vols.
(Cairo, 1292 A.H.).

Al-JīlanI, ᶜAbd al-Qādir
Ghunyāt al-Tālibīn
(Delhi, 1300 A.H.).

Al-Khaṭib al-Baghdādī, Aḥmad b. ᶜAlī (d.463 A.H.)
Al-Kifāya fī ᶜIlm al-Riwāya
eds. ᶜAbd al-Halim Muḥammad and ᶜAbd al-
Raḥmān Ḥasan (Cairo, 1972).

Sharaf Aṣḥāb al-Hadīth
ed. M.S. Hatibuglu (Ankara, 1971)

Taqyīd al-ᶜIlm ed. Yusuf al-ᶜIsh
(Damascus, 1949)

Ta'rīkh Baghdād,
(Cairo, 1931).

Khaṭib al-Tabrīzi, Abū ᶜAbdAllah Muḥammad b. ᶜAbdAllah
Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ, ed. M. Nasir al-DIn al-
Albani, (Beirut, 1961).

Al-Khayyāt, ᶜAbd al-Raḥīm
Kitāb al-Intiṣār ed. Nyberg
(Beirut, 1957).

Al-Kumayt (d. 126 A.H.)
Al-Hāshimīyāt ed. Al-Sāydawī
(Cairo, 1950).

Die Hashimijjat ed. Horovitz
(Leiden, 1907)

Mālik b. Anas (d. 179 A.H.)
Al-Muwaṭṭā', 2nd ed. ᶜAbd al-Wahhāb ᶜAbd al-Latif (Cairo, 1967).

Al-Maqrizi, Ahmad b. ᶜAlī (d. 845 A.H.)
Al-Nizā' wa al-Takhāsum bayn al-Bani Umayya wa Banī Hāshim
(Najaf, 1368 A.H.)

- K. al-Mawāᶜiz wa al-Iᶜtibār b. Dhikr al-Khiṭaṭ al-Āthār, 2 Vols.
(Cairo, 1270 A.H.)

Al-Masᶜūdi, ᶜAlī b. Ḥusayn (d. 346 A.H.)
Muriw al-Dhahab, ed. M.M. ᶜAbd al-Hamid
4th Edition
(Cairo, 1964).

- Kitāb al-Tanbīh wa al-Ishrāf
(Leiden, 1894)

Al-Minqarī, Naṣr b. Muzāhim
Waqᶜat Ṣiffin
(Cairo, 1365 A.H.).

Al-Mubarrad, Muḥammad b. Yazīd
K. al-Kāmil,
(Cairo, n.d.).

Al-Mufaddal b. Muḥammad
Al-Mufaddaliyyāt, ed. Charles J. Lyall,
(Oxford, 1921).

Murtaḍa b. Dāᶜī
K. Tabsirāt al-ᶜAwwām
(Tehran, 1313 A.H.).

Murtaḍa al-Zabīdī, Abū al-Fayd Muḥammad
(d.1205 A.H.)
Tāj al ᶜArūs
10 vols.
(Cairo 1285-1307 A.H.).

Musᶜab al-Zubayrī, Abū ᶜAbdAllah (d.236 A.H.)
Nasab Quraysh
(Cairo, 1953).

Muslim b. al-Hajjāj, Abū al-Ḥusayn (d. 261 A.H.)
Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, ed. H.M. al-Masᶜūdī
8 vols.
(Cairo, 1930).

Al-Nasā'ī, Aḥmād b. Shuᶜayb (d.303 A.H.)
Sunan al-Nasā'ī ed. H.M. al-Masᶜūdī
8 vols, (Cairo, 1930)

Al-Nawawī, Abū Zakarīya Muhyī al-DIn (d.676 A.H.)
Tahdhīb al-Asmā' wa al-Lughāt
2 vols.
(Cairo, n.d.).

Al-Nuwayrī, Shihāb al-DIn Aḥmad b. ᶜAbd al-Wahhāb
Nihayat al-'Arab fi funun al-Adab
18 vols.
(Cairo, 1923-55).

Al-Qalqashandī, Abū al-Abbās Aḥmad b ᶜAlī
(d.821 A.H.)
Ṣubḥ al-Aᶜshā
14 vols.
(Cairo 1919-1922).

Al-Qastalānī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad (d. 922 A.H.)
Irshād al-Sārī b. Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī
10 vols.
(Cairo, 1323-27 A.H.)

Al-Qāḍī Abd al-Jabbār
Al-Mughni (Dar al-Miṣrīya, n.d.)

Al-Qurṭubī, Muḥammad b. Aḥmad
Al-Jāmīᶜ li Aḥkām al-Qur'ān
(Cairo, 1967).

Al-Rāzī, Fakhr al-Dīn
Iᶜtīqādāt al-Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikin (Cairo, 1338 A.H.).

Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb
(Cairo, n.d.).

Riḍa Kaḥḥāla ᶜUmar
Muᶜjam al-Mu'allifīn
(Damascus, 1957).

Al-Ṣābūnī, Nūr al-Dīn
Al-Bidāya min al-kifāya min ᶜilm Uṣūl al-Dīn
ed. F. Khulayf
(Cairo, 1969).

Al-Sadūsī, Muᶜarij b. ᶜAmr (d. 195 A.H.)
Ḥadhfan min Nasab Quraysh
ed. S. al-Munajjid
(Cairo, 1960).

Al-Ṣafadī, Khalīl b. Ījbak (d. 968 A.H.)
Al-Wāfī bī al-Wafayāt
(Cairo, n.d.)

Al-Sakhāwī, Shams al-Dīn Abu al-Khayr Muḥammad b. Abd. al-Rahman (d. 902 A.H.)
Al-Maqāsid al-Ḥasana
(Baghdad, 1956).

Fatḥ al-Mughīth bī Sharḥ alfīyyāt al-Ḥadīth
(Lucknow, 1282 A.H.).

al-Iᶜlān bi al-Tawbīkh li man Dhamma al-Ta'rīkh ed. S. Aḥmad b. ᶜAli al ᶜAli
(Baghdad, 1963)

Al-Ṣāliḥ, Ṣubḥī
ᶜUlum al-Ḥadīth wa Mustalaḥuh
4th ed.
(Beirut, 1966).

Al-Samᶜanī ᶜAbd al-Karīm b. Muḥammad (d.562 A.H.)
Kitāb al-Ansāb
(Hyderabad, 1966).

Adab al-Imlā' wa al-Istimlā'
ed. Max Weisweiler,
(Leiden, 1955)

Al-Ṣanᶜānī, ᶜAbd al-Razzāq b. Hammām (d. 211 A.H.
Al-Muṣannaf, ed. H.R. al-Aᶜẓamī
11 vols.
(Beirut, 1970-72).

Al-Shāfiᶜī Abū ᶜAbdAllāh Muḥammad b. Idrīs (d.204 A.H.)
Kitāb al-Umm, 7 vols.
(Cairo, 1325 A.H.)

Al-Musnad, ed. M.Z. al-Kawtharī
(Cairo, 1951).

Al-Risāla ed. A.M. Shākir
(Cairo, 1938).

Al-Shahrastānī
K. al-Milal wa al-Niḥal ed. W. Cureton,
(London, 1946).

Al-Sijistānī ᶜAbdAllāh b. Abī Dā'ūd (d. 316 A.H.)
Kitāb al-Maṣāhif ed. A. Jeffery,
(Cairo, 1936).

Al-Suyūtī, Jalāl al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍl ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān b. al-Kāmil (d. 911 A.H.)
Asbāb al-Nuzūl
(Cairo, 1382 A.H.)

- Al-Durr al-Manthūr fī al-Tafsīr bi al-Ma'thūr
6 vols. (Beirut, n.d.)

Al-Itqān fi ᶜUlum al-Qur'ān
2 vols. ed. M. A. Ibrahim,
(Cairo, 1967).

Al-Ṭabarī, Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad b.Jarīr (d.310 A.H
Jāmiᶜ al-Bayān fi tafsīr al-Qur'ān
ed. Muḥammad al- Zuhri al-Ghamrāwī
(Cairo, 1321 A.H.).

Ta'rīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk
2nd ed. 10 vols.
(Cairo, 1967-69).

Annales ed. M. J. de Goeje in 3 series of
6, 3 and 4 vols. respectively.
(Leiden, 1879-1901).

Al-Mukhtasar min kitāb al-Dhayl al-Mudhayya
(Cairo, 1929)

Al-Tahānawī, Zafar Aḥmad al-ᶜUthmānī
Qawāᶜid fi ᶜUlum al-Ḥadīth
ed. ᶜAbd al-Fattah Abu Ghudda,
(Beirut and Aleppo, 1972)

Al-Tanūkhī, Saḥnūn Ibn Saᶜīd
Al-Mudawwana al-Kubra, 16 vols.
(Cairo, 1323-24 A.H.).

Al-Tayālīsī, Abu Dā'ūd Sulaymān b. Dā'ud
(d. 204 A.H.)
Musnad al-Tayālīsī ed. A.H. al-Amrahī et.al
(Hyderabad, 1321 A.H.)

Al-Tha^{c}labī Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ibrahīm
Qiṣaṣ al-'Anbīyā' al-Musammā b. al-^{c}Arā'is
(Cairo, n.d.)

Al-Tirmidhī, Abū ^{c}Īsā Muḥammad b. ^{c}Īsā
(d. 279 A.H.)
Al-Jāmī^{c} al-Ṣaḥiḥ
(Cairo, 1962-68).

Al-Wāqidī, Muḥammad b. ^{c}Umar (d. 207 A.H.)
Kitāb al-Maghāzī ed. M. Jones, 3 vols.
(London, 1966).

Al-Ya^{c}qubī, Aḥmad b. Ja^{c}far b. Wahb Ibn Waḍiḥ
Ta'rīkh Vols. I and II
(Beirut n.d.).

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, Shihāb al-Dīn (d. 626 A.H.)
Irshād al-Arīb ia Ma^{c}rifat al-Adih (Mu^{c}jam al-Udabā'
ed. D. S. Margoliouth, 2nd ed. 7 vols.
(London, 1923).

Mu^{c}jam al-Buldān
(Cairo, 1906).

Al-Zamakhsharī, Muḥammad b. ^{c}Umar (d.538 A.H.)
Al-Kashshāf 4 vols.
(Cairo, 1354 A.G.)

Al-Fa'iq fī Gharīb al-Hadīth
ed. ^{c}Ali M. al-Bajāwi and Muḥammad Abū al Faḍl Ibrahim, 3 vols.
(Cairo, 1945-48).

Al-Zarkalī, Khayr al-Dīn
Al-A^{c}lām
(Cairo, 1954).

Al-Zarkashī, Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad b.ᶜAbdAllah
(d. 794 A.H.)
Al-Burhān fī ᶜUlūm al-Qur'ān
2 vols. ed. M. A. Ibrāhim
(Cairo, 1957).

Zayd, Mustafa
Al-Naskh fī al-Qur'ān al-Karim
(Cairo, 1963).

Al-Zurqānī, Muḥammad b. ᶜAbd al-Bāqī (d.1122 A.H)
Manāhil al-ᶜIrfān fī ᶜUlūm al-Qur'ān
2 vols. 3rd ed.
(Cairo, 1372 A.H.)

Sharḥ al-Zurqānī ᶜalā Muwaṭṭā' al-Imām Mālik 4 vols.
(Cairo, 1936).

3. Shī^{c}ite sources

^{c}Alī b. al-Walīd
Tāj al-^{c}aqā'id ed A. Tāmir
Dār al-Mashriq, (Beirut, 1967)

Abū Firās, Shihab al-Dīn
Al-Shāfiya (attr.) ed. and trans. with introduction and commentary by S.N. Makarem Publication of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, American University of Beirut, Oriental Series No.48 (Beirut, 1966).

Abū al-Fawāris, Aḥmad ibn Ya^{c}qūb
Al-Risāla fī al-Imāma, ed. and trans. with introduction and commentary by S.N. Makarem Caravan Books, (Delmar, New York, 1977)

Al-Barqī, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khālid
Kitāb al-Maḥāsin,
(Tehran, 1370/1950))

Kitāb al-Rijāl
(Tehran, 1342 A.H.)

Al-Hā'irī, Muḥammad b. Ismā^{c}īl
Muntaha al-Maqāl,
(Tehran, 1302 A.H.)

Al-Hillī, Ḥasan b. Yūsuf
Al-Bāb al-Ḥādī ^{c}Ashar, trans. W.M. Miller;
(London, 1928)

Kashf al Murād fī Tajrīd al-I^{c}tiqād
(Mashshad, n.d.)

Kashf al-Yaqīn fī Faḍā'il Amir al-Mu'minīn
(Tehran, 1880)

Rijāl, ed. Muhammad Sadiq;
(Najaf, 1961).

Ibn AbĪ al-Ḥadīd
Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha, ed. M. Abū al-Fadl Ibrāhim,
(Cairo, 1959).

Ibn Aᶜtham, Aḥmad al-Kūfī
Kitāb al-Futūḥ, vols. 1-8
(Haydrabad, 1395/1975)

Ibn Babawayhī al-Qummī, Abū Jaᶜfar Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī
ᶜIlal al-Sharā'i,
(Najaf, 1963)

Maᶜānī al-Akhbār,
(Tehran, 1379 A.H.)

Man lā yahduru al-faqīh, 4 vols.
(Tehran, 1390 A.H.)

Al-Tawhīd,
(Tehran, 1387/1967)

Ibn Dāwūd, al-Ḥasan b. ᶜAlī al-Hillī,
Kitāb al-Rijāl,
(Tehran, 1964)

Ibn Furāt al-Kūfī, Furat b. Ibrāhīm
Tafsīr Furāt al-Kūfī,
(Najaf, n.d.)

Ibn HibbatAllah, Dīya' al-dīn Ismāᶜīl
Mizāj al-tasnīm, ed. R. Strothmann,
(Gottingen, 1844, 1948)

Ibn Shādhān al-Faḍl (d. 260/873)
Kitāb al-Īḍāh,
(Tehran, n.d.)

Ibn Shahr Ashwab, Muḥammad b. ᶜAlī
Maᶜālim al-ᶜUlamā'
(Tehran, 1353 A.H.)

Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib,
(Najaf, 1956)

Idrīs, ᶜImād al-Dīn
ᶜUyūn al-Akhbār, ed. M. Ghalib, vol.4
(Beirut, 1973)

Zahr al-maᶜānī, Arabic excerpts in Ivanow,
The Rise of the Fatimids, pp.47-80.

Al-Irbilī, ᶜAlī b.ᶜĪsā
Kashf al-ghumma fi Maᶜrifat al-A'imma,
vols. 1-2, (Tabriz, Qumm, 1381, 1961)
and vols. 1-3, (Najaf, 1965)

Jaᶜfar b. Manṣūr al-Yaman
Asrār al-Nutaqā' wa Sarā'ir al-Nutaqā'
ed. M. Ghalib, Dār al-Andalus
(Beirut, 1985)

Kitāb al-Kashf, ed. R. Strothmann;
Islamic Research Association, series, no.13
Oxford University Press,
(London, 1952).

Al-Kashshī, Muḥammad b. ᶜUmar
Ikhtiyār Maᶜrifat al-Rijāl,
(Mashshad, 1348)

Al-Kirmānī, Aḥmad Ḥamīd al-Dīn
Al- Masābīḥ fi Ithbāt al-Imāma, ed. M. Ghālib, Manshurat Hamad (Beirut, 1969)

Rāhat al-ᶜAql, ed. M. Ghālib, Dār al-Andalus, (Beirut, 1967) also The Ismaili Society series C-1 ed. with an introduction by M.K. Husayn and M.M. Hilmi Dār al-fikr al-ᶜArabī and E.J. Brill. (Cairo, Leiden, 1952).

Al-Kulaynī, Muḥammad b. Yaᶜqub,
Al-Usūl min al-Kāfī
(Tehran, 1388)

Al-Furū' min al-Kāfī
(Tehran, 1890)

Al-Rawḍa min al-Kāfī
(Tehran, n.d.)

Al-Majlisī, Muḥammad Baqir b. Muḥammad Taqī
Biḥār al-Anwār,
(Tehran, 1376 -)

Manṣūr al-Yaman
Kitāb al-rushd wa al-hidāya (a section)
ed. M.K. Husayn in Collectanea, I, 185-213.

Al-Muᶜayyad fī al-Dīn al-Shirāzī
Dīwān al-Muᶜayyad fī al-Dīn,
ed. M.K. Husayn with an introduction
Dār al-Kātib al-Misrī,
(Cairo, 1949)

Sīra al-Muᶜayyad fī al-Dīn
ed. M.K. Husayn, Dār al-Kātib al-Misrī,
(Cairo, 1949).

Al-Mufīd, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. al-Nuᶜmān
Awā'il al-Māqalāt fī al-Maqālat fī al-Madhāhib wa al-Mukhtārāt,
(Tabrizz, 1371).

Al-Irshād,
(Najaf, 1392/1972)

Al-Muqniᶜa fī al-Fiqh,
(Qumm, 1966)

Taṣḥīḥ Iᶜtiqādāt al-Imāmīya
(Tabriz, 1371, 1951)

Al-Najāshī, Aḥmad b. ᶜAlī b. Aḥmad
Kitāb al-Rijāl,
(Tehran n.d.)

Al-Nawbakhtī, al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā
Firaq al-Shīᶜa, ed. H. Ritter
(Leipzig, 1931)

Al-Nīsāburī, Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm
Istitār al-Imām, trans. by W. Ivanow in The Rise of the Fātimids, Oxford University Press (London, 1942).

Al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān, Abū Ḥanīfa b. Muḥammad
Asās al-ta'wīl, ed. A. Tāmir, Dār al-Thaqāfa,
(Beirut, 1960)

Daᶜā'im al-Islām, ed. with an introduction by A.A.A. Fyzee, 2 vols: Dār al-Maᶜārif (Cairo, 1950 and 1960).

Ikhtilāf usūl al-Madhāhib,
ed. Lokhand wala,
(Simla, 1972)

Kitāb al-Himma fi Ādāb Atibā^{c} al-A'imma
ed. M.K. Husayn, Dār al-Fikr al-^{c}Arabi
(Cairo, n.d.)

Ta'wil al-Da^{c}ā'im, ed. Ādil al-^{c}Awwa in
Muntakhabāt Ismā^{c}īlīya, also ed.
M.H. A^{c}zami Dār al-Ma^{c}ārif
(Cairo, 1968-72).

Al-Urjūza al-Mukhtāra, ed. with commentary
by I.K.H. Poonawala, Institute of Islamic
Studies McGill Universsity, (Montreal, 1970).

Al-Qummī, ^{c}Alī b. Ibrāhīm
Al-Tafsīr, vol. 1-2
(Najaf, 1386/1966)

Al-Rāzī, Abū Ḥātim
Kitāb al-Zīna, - section on Muslim sects.ed.
by al-Sāmarrā'ī in al-Ghulūw, (Baghdad,
1972).

Sharīf al-Murtaḍa, Abu al-Qasim ^{c}Alī b. al-Ḥusayn
Kitāb al-Intiṣar, Al-Matba^{c}at al-Haydarīya
(Najaf, 1971)

Al-Shafī fī al-Imama,
(Tehran, 1301/1883)

Al-Fuṣūl al-Mukhtāra min al^{c}Uyūn wa al-
Maḥāsin li al-Mufīd,
(Najaf, 1966)

Al-Sijistanī, Abu Yaᶜqūb
Ithbāt al-Nabuwwa, ed. with an introduction by A. Tāmir (Beirut, 1966).

Kashf al-Maḥjūb
(Iran and France, 1949)

Kitāb al-Yanābīᶜ ed. and trans. by H. Corbin in Trilogue Ismaelienne.

Al-Ṭabarsī, Abū ᶜAlī al-Faḍl b. al-Ḥasan
Iᶜlam al-warā' bi aᶜlam al-hudā
(Tehran, 1379/1959)

Majmuᶜ al-bayān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān,
(Tehran, 1395)

Al-Ṭabarsī, Abū Mansūr Ahmad b. ᶜAlī b. Abi Ṭālib
Al-Ihtijāj, ed. S.M. Bāqir al-Khirsan,
2 vols. Dār al-Nuᶜmān (Beirut, 1966).

Al-Ṭūsī, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan,
Al-Amālī, 2 vols.
(Najaf, 1383/1963)

Al-Fihrist, ed. Sprenger
(Calcutta, 1853 and Mashhad, 1972)

Ikhtiyār Maᶜrifat al-Rijāl,
(Mashhad, 1348/1969)

Al-Istibṣār, 4 vols.
(Tehran, 1390/1970)

Al-Mabsūt, 8 vols
(Tehran, 1387)

Al-Nihāya fi Mujarrad al-fiqh wa al-Fatāwa,
(Tehran, 1970)

Kitāb al-Rijāl,
(Najaf, 1381/1961)

Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām, 10 vols.
(Tehran, 1390/1970)

Talkhīs al-Shāfi,
(Qumm, 1394/1973)

Tafsīr al-Tibyān, 10 vols.
(Najaf, 1957)

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

2. Books, Theses and Periodicals

Abbot, Nabia
Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri
(Chicago, 1957-72).

Ali, Ameer,
Muhammadan Law
(London, 1936).

The Spirit of Islam, Christophers
(London, 1935)

Al-Amīn, Muḥsin b. ᶜAbd al-Karīm
Aᶜyān al-Shīᶜa
(Damascus, 1935)

Al-Amīnī, Muḥammad Hādī
ᶜId al-Ghadīr
(Najaf, 1962).

Al-Amīn, Ḥasan
Islamic Shīᶜite Encyclopaedia, Vols. 1-4
(Beirut, n.d.)

Arnold, Thomas W.,
The Caliphate, Clarendon Press
(Oxford, 1924).

The Preaching Of Islam, Luzac & Co.
(London 1935).

Ayoub, Mahmoud
Redemptive Suffering in Islam, a Study of the devotional aspects of ᶜAshura' in Twelver Shiᶜism. Religion and Society Series, No.10
Mouton Publishers, (The Hague, 1978).

Baillie, John
A Digest of Mohammadan Law according to the sect of the Twelve Imams (compiled under the superintendence of Sir W. Jones).
(Calcutta, 1805).

Baillie, Neil B.E.
A Digest of Moohummunudan Law. Imameea Code
Smith, Elder & Co.,
(London, 1869)

Bosworth, Clifford E.
The Islamic Dynasties. Islamic Survey No.5
Edinburgh University Press,
(Edinburgh, 1967)

Brockelmann, Carl,
Gieschicte der Arabischen Litteratur, 2nd ed.
E.J. Brill. (Leiden, 1943-49) and three suppl. vols. (Leiden, 1937-42).

History of the Islamic Peoples trans. Joel Carlmichael and Moshe Perlmann. Capricorn Books, (New York, 1960).

Calder, Norman,
"The Structure of Authority in Imami ShīCī Jurisprudence" Ph.D., School of Oriental and African Studies, (Univ. of London, 1980)

Cambridge History of Islam
ed. P.M. Holt *et al* 2 vols. Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge, 1970).

Corbin, Henri
"De la gnose antique á la gnose ismaelienne"
Convegno di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche.

"Rituel Sabein et exegese ismaelien du rituel" Eranos - Jahrbuch 19 (1950).

Trilogie Ismaelienne Tehran : Department d'iranologie de I'institut franco-iranien; Paris : Institut d'etudes iraniennes de l'universite de Paris, 1961.

Coulson, Noel J.
A History of Islamic Law. Islamic Surveys, No.2, Edinburgh University Press, (Edinburgh, 1964).

Conflicts and Tensions in Islamic Jurisprudence
University of Chicago Press, (Chicago, 1969).

Succession in the Muslim Family
Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge, 1971).

Darmester, James
The Mahdi, Past and Present tr. from the French by Ada S. Ballin (Harper's Handy Series) : Harper and Bros., (New York 1885).

Donaldson, Dwight M.
The Shīᶜite Religion. Luzac & Co., (London, 1933).

"The Shīᶜah Doctrine of the Imamate"
MW, 21 (1931) pp.14-23.

Eliash, Joseph,
"The Ithnāᶜasharī - Shīᶜī Juristic Theory of Political and Legal Authority"
Studia Islamica, 29 (1969) pp.17-30.

The Shīᶜite Qur'ān". Arabica, 16 (1969) pp.15-24.

"On the Genesis and Development of the Twelver - Shīᶜī three-tenet Shahādah" Der Islam 47 (1971) pp.265-72.

The Encyclopaedia of Islam. 1st ed.
(ed. M.T.Houtsma et.al) 1913-34, 4 vols.
E.J. Brill (Leiden, 1913-38):
Luzac & Co. (London, 1913-34)

New ed. (ed. H.A.R.Gibb et.al) 5 vols.
E.J. Brill (Leiden, 1954 -) Luzac & Co.
(London, 1956 -).

Ezzati, Abū'l Faḍl.
An Introduction to Shīᶜī Islamic Law and Jurisprudence,
Ashraf Press, (Lahore, 1976).

Friedlander, Israel,
"The Heterodoxies of the Shīᶜites in the Presentation of Ibin Hazm' JAOS
I, 28 (1907) pp.1-80.
II, 29 (1908) pp.1-183

Fyzee, A.A.A.
"Bequests to heirs : Ismāᶜīlī Shīᶜa Law" JBBRAS, 5 (1929), 141-45 and Bombay Law Reporter, Journal (1929), 84-87.

Compendium of Fatimid Law
(Simla, 1969).

"A note on the Fatimid jurist Nu^{c}man and his book, The Pillars of Islam (summary)" in Proceedings of the twenty-second Congress of Orientalists held in Istanbul, Sept. 15-22, 1951, (Leiden, 1957) 11, 245-7.

"Ismā^{c}īlī law and its founder" IC, 9 (1935), 107-12.

"The Ismā^{c}īlī law of mut^{c}a" JBBRAS, 8 (1932), 85-92.

"The Ismā^{c}īlī law of wills (London, 1934).

"Nu^{c}mān" EI

"Qāḍi al-Nu^{c}mān : The Fatimid jurist and author" JRAS (1934), 1-32.

"The Study of the literature of the Fatimid da^{c}wa" in Arabic and Islamic Studies in honor of H.A.R. Gibb, edited by George Makdisi, (Leiden 1965), 232-49

Ghalib, Mustafa
A^{c}lam al-Ismā^{c}īlīya, Dār al-Yaqza al-^{c}Arabīya (Beirut, 1964)

Ta'rīkh al-da^{c}wā al-Ismā^{c}īlīya, Dār al-Yaqza al-^{c}Arabiya (Damascus, 1953).

Gibb, H.A.R.
Studies on the Civilization of Islam
eds. Stanford J. Shaw and William R. Polk,
Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.,
(London, 1962)

Mohammedanism, (Oxford University Press 1942)

Goldziher, Ignaz,
Mohammad and Islam (trans) Kate Seelye,
Yale University Press,
(New Haven, 1917)

Muslim Studies, vol. 2 (trans. C.R. Barber and S.M. Stern)
(London, 1971)

Gottheil, Richard,
"A Distinguished Family of Fatimid Qadis in the Tenth Century" JAOS, vol.27, and half (1907), pp.217-296.

Hungronje, C. Snouck
Mohammedanism, Columbia University Press
(New York, 1928)

Guillaume, Alfred,
The Traditions of Islam. An Introduction to the Study of Hadith Literature. Khayats
(Beirut, 1966)

The Life of Muḥammad, a translation of Ishaq's Sīrāt Rasul Allah, Oxford University Press, (London, 1955)

Hamdani, Abbas
"Kitab az-Zīnat of Abū Ḥāṭīm ar-Rāzī" in Actes du XXI^e Congres International des Orientalistes, Paris 23-31 Juillet 1948.
(Paris, 1949) 291-94.

Hamdani, Ḥusayn F.,
"Abū Ḥatim al-Rāzī" Revue Islamique (La Pensee Chiite) (1960), 27-8.

"A compendium of Ismā^{c}īlī esoterics"
IC II (1937), 210-220.

"Some Unknown Ismā^{c}īlī Authors and their works"
JRAS, (1933), 210-227.

Hitti, P.K.
History of the Arabs
(London, 1985)

History of Syria (including Lebanon and Palestine)
(London, 1951)

Hodgson, Marshall
The Venture of Islam, 3 vols.
University of Chicago Press,
(Chicago, 1974)

"How did the Early Shī^{c}a become sectarian?"
JAOS, 75 (1955) pp.1-13.

Hollister, John N.
The Shī^{c}a of India, Luzac & Co.
(London, 1953)

Howard I.K.A. (trans.)
Kitab al Irshād (of Shaykh al-Mufīd)
Balagha Books, Horsham, W. Sussex, and
Muhammad Trust, (London, 1981).

Imami Shī^{c}ī Ritual in the contest of early Islamic Jurisprudence,
(unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge, 1975)

"Mut^{c}a marriage reconsidered in the context of the formal procedures for Islamic marriage",
Journal of Semitic Studies Vol. XX, No. 2
(Spring 1975) 82-92

"The development of the Adhān and Iqāma of the Ṣalāt in Early Islam"
Journal of Semitic Studies Vol. 26, ii (1981)

Ivanow, Wladimir,
A Guide to Ismāᶜīlī Literature. Prize Publication Fund series, voll3, Royal Asiatic Society, (London, 1933)

A Creed of the Fātimids (a summary of the Tāj al- ᶜaqā'id by Sayyid-nā ᶜAlí b. Muhammad b. al- Walid. Qayyimah Press. (Bombay, 1936)

"Early Shīᶜite movements"
JBBRAS, 16 (1941), 1-23.

Ismāᶜīlī Literature : A Bibliographical survey (London, 1933)

"Notes sur l'Ummu'l Kitab" : Des Ismaeliens de l'Asia Centrale" REI, 6 (1932) 419-82

"The Organization of Fātimid Propaganda"
JBBRAS, 15 (1939), 1-35.

Ismāᶜīlī Tradition Concerning the Rise of the Fātimids. Islamic Research Association Series No.10. Oxford University Press, (London, 1942).

The Alleged Founder of Ismāᶜīlīsm, The Ismaili Society, Series A, no.15 (Bombay, 1946)

Jafri, S. Husain M.
Origins and Early Development of Shīᶜa Islam Longman, London and New York and Librarie du Liban, (Beirut, 1979).

Kazi, A.K. and J.G. Flynn
"Shahristānī, Kitāb al-Milal w'al-niḥal translated. VI: The Shi^{c}ite"
Abr Nahrain 15 (1975) pp. 50-98
Muslim Sects and Divisions (trans.) The section on Muslim Sects in Kitāb al-Milal wa'l-Niḥal by M.A. Shahrastānī, Kegan Paul International (Great Britain, 1984).

Kohlberg, Etan
"Some notes on the Imami attitude to the Qur'an" in Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition : Essays presented to R. Walzer eds. S.M. Stern, A. Hourani and Y. Brown. Cassirer, (Oxford, 1972) pp. 209-24.

"Some Imami - Shī^{c}ī views on taqiyya"
JAOS 95 (1975), pp.395-402.

"An unusual Shī^{c}ī isnād"
Israel Oriental Studies V (1975) pp. 142-9

"From Imāmiyya to Ithnā ^{c}Ashariyya
BSOAS 39 (1976), pp. 521-34.

"The Development of the Imāmī Shī^{c}ī doctrine of Jihād".
Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganlandischen Gesselschaft, 126 (1976), pp.64-86.

"The term 'Rāfida' in Imami Shī^{c}ī usage"
JAOS, 99 (1980), pp.677-79.

Lane, Edward W.,
An Arabic - English Lexicon, 8 vols.
Williams and Norgate,
(London and Edinburgh, 1863)

Lane-Poole, Stanley,
The Muhammadan Dynasties,
Archibald Constable & Co.,
(London, 1894).

Lammens, Henri,
Islam : Beliefs and Institutions tr. from the French by Sir E. Denison Ross, Methuen & Co., (London, 1929).

Laoust, Henri,
Le schismes dans l'Islam, Payot, (Paris, 1965).

Lewis, Bernard,
The Arabs in History
(Hutchinson's University Library, 1950).

The Origins of Ismā^{c}īlīsm,
W. Heffer & Sons Ltd.,
(Cambridge, 1940)

"An Ismā^{c}īlī interpretation of the fall of Adam" 9 BSOS, 9 (1938), 691-704.

Linant de Bellefonds, Yvon.
"Le Droit Imamite" in Le Shī^{c}isme Imamite Colloque de Strasbourg 1968, Presses Universitaires,
(Paris, 1970) pp.183-99.

Lings, Martin,
Muhammad his life based on the earliest sources.
Islamic texts Society and George Allen and Unwin, (London, 1983).

MacDermott, Martin J.,
The Theology of al-Shaikh al-Mufīd,
Recherches, Nouvelle Serie : A; Langue arabe et Pensee Islamique 10; Persian Studies series No.9. Dar al-Machreq Editeurs, (Beirut, 1978).

MacDonald, D.B.
Development of Muslim Theology Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory :
Charles Scribner's Sons,
(New York, 1903)

Mamour, Prince P.H.,
Polemics on the Origin of the Fatimi Caliphs
Luzac & Co., (London, 1934).

Margoliouth, D.S.
The Early Development of Mohammedanism,
Charles Scribner's sons
(New York, 1914).

Majduᶜ, Ismāᶜīl Ibn ᶜAbd al-Rasūl
Fihrist al-Majdūᶜ, edited by Alinagi Monzavi, Tehran University Printing House (Tehran, 1966).

Makarem, Sami Nasib.
"Al-Amr al-Ilāhī wa mafhūmuhu fil - ᶜAqida al-Ismāᶜīliyya" *al-Abbath* 20 (1967)

The Doctrine of the Ismāᶜīlis : Arab Institute for Research and Publishing, (Beirut, 1972)

"The Philosophical Significance of the Imam in Ismāᶜīlīsm" *SI* 27 (1967).

The Political Doctrine of the Ismāᶜīlis. An edition and Translation, with Introduction and Notes of Abū l-Fawāris Aḥmad ibn Yaᶜūb's *ar-Risāla fi l-Imāma*, Caravan Books (Delmar, New York, 1977).

Madelung, Wilferd,
"Das Imamat in der fruhen ismailitischen Lehre" *Der Islam*, 37 (1961) 43-135.

"Imamism and Muᶜtazilite Theology" in Le Shīᶜisme Imamite Colloque de Strasbourg 1968, Presses Universitaires, (Paris, 1970) pp.13-30.

Der Islam al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm und die Glaubenslehre der Zaiditen (Berlin, 1965).

EI² S.V. "Imama" and "Ismāᶜīliyya" "Djābir al-Ǧuᶜfī", "Kaysāniyya", "Kuraybiyya", "Batriyya"

"The Sources of Ismāᶜīlī law JNES 35 (1976), 29-40.

Mashkūr, Muḥammad Jawād
"An-Nawbakhtī, Le Sectes Si'ites" Revue de l'Histoire de Religions 153 (1958) pp. 68-78; 176-214; 154 (1958) pp. 67-95; 146-72; 155 (1959) pp.63-78.

Morgan, Kenneth, W. (ed.)
Islam, The Straight Path, Ronald Press Co., (New York, 1958).

Momen, Moojan
An Introduction to Shīᶜī Islam, Yale University Press (New Haven and London, 1985).

Muir, William,
The Caliphate : Its Rise, Decline and Fall, (Edinburgh, 1924)

al-Muzaffar, Muhammad Rida
The Faith of Shīᶜa Islam, Ansariyan Publications, (Qumm, 1982)

Nanji, Azim,
"An Ismāᶜīlī theory of walāya, in the Daᶜā'im al-Islam of Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān" in Essays on Islamic civilization presented to Niyazi Berkes, ed. D.P.Little. E.J. Brill (Leiden, 1976) 260-73.

Nicholson, R.A.
A Literary History of the Arabs,
(Cambridge University Press, 1930)

Pearson, J.D.
Index Islamicus (1906-55): A catalogue of articles on Islamic subjects in periodicals and other collective publications.
W. Heffer & Sons. Ltd.,
(Cambridge, 1958 -

Petersen, E.L.
ᶜAlī and Muᶜāwiya in Early Arabic Tradition,
(Copenhagen, 1964)

Poonawala, I.K.
"Al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān's work and the sources" BSOAS 36(1973), 109-15.

"Reconsideration of al-Qāḍī al-Nuᶜmān's madhhab" BSOAS, 37 (1974), 572-79.

"Al-Sijistānī and his kitab al-Maqālīd" in Essays on Islamic civilization presented to Niyazi Berkes, edited by D.P. Little E.J. Brill, (Leiden, 1976) pp.274-83.

Biobibliography of Ismāᶜīlī Literature
Undena Publications, (Malibu, California, 1977).

Rajkowski, W.
"Early Shīᶜism in Iraq" Ph.D. thesis
(University of London, 1955).

Rice W. A.
"Alī in Shīᶜa Tradition"
MW, 4 (1914)

Ritter, H.,
"Philologika III : Muhammadanische Haresiographen" Der Islam, 18 (1929), 34-54.

Sachedina, Abdulaziz A.
Islamic Messianism : the idea of the Mahdī in Twelver Shiᶜism. State University of New York Press, (Albany, 1981).

Salem, Elie A.
Political Theory and Institutions of the Khawarij,
John Hopkins Press,
(Baltimore, 1956)

al-Sāmarrā'ī, ᶜAbdAllāh Salūm
Al-Ghulūw wa al-firaq al-ghālīya fi al-hadārat al-Islāmīya
(Baghdad, 1972).

Salisbury, Edward E.
"Translation of an unpublished Arabic Risala by Khaled ibn Zeid al Juᶜfy (with notes)
JAOS, vol. III (1851-53) pp. 167-193.

"Translation of two unpublished Arabic documents relating to the doctrines of the Ismāᶜīlīs and other Batinian sects"
JAOS, vol. II (1850-51) pp.257-324.

Schacht, Joseph,
Origins of Muhammadan Jursprudence,
(Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1953).

An Introduction to Islamic Law,
(Clarendon Press, Oxford 1979)

Schuon, Frithjof
Understanding Islam (trans. D.M. Matheson)
George Allen and Unwin
(London, 1963).

Sell, Rev. Canon
Ithna ᶜAsharīyya or the Twelve Shīᶜah Imams
(Christian Literature Society for India
Madras, etc. 1923).

Sezgin, Fuat,
Geschichte de Arabischen Schriftums
E.J. Brill (Leiden, 1967 -).

Strothmann, Rudolf,
Die Zwolfer-Schīᶜa. Otto Harrassowitz
(Leipzig, 1926).

Gnosis - Texte der Ismailiten. Abhandlungen
der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Gottingen,
Dritte Folge, no. 28. Vandenhoek & Ruprecht,
(Gottingen, 1943).

"Taḳīya" in EI[1]

"Kleinere Ismailitische Schriften" in
Islamic Reserach Association Miscellany,
vol. 1 (1948) Islamic Reesearch Association
Series no. 11, Oxford University Press
(Calcutta, 1949).

"Recht der Ismailiten" Der Islam,
42 (1954), 131-46.

Stern S.M.
"Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī" EI[2]

"Abū Yaᶜqūb al-Sidjistānī EI[2]

Studies in Early Ismāᶜīlīsm
(Jerusalem, 1983)

Tabatabā'ī ᶜAllamah S. M. Ḥusayn
Shīᶜite Islam. (trans. and ed. by S.H. Nasr) George Allen and Unwin (London, 1975).

Tamer, Aref
(ed.) Arbaᶜ Rasā'il Ismāᶜīliyya. Dār al-Kashshāf (Beirut, 1953).

ed. Khams Rasā'il Ismāᶜīliyya. Dar al-Jusaf (Beirut, 1956).

"Furūᶜ al-Shajarah al-Ismāᶜīliyya" in the Journal al-Mashriq (1958) 581-612.

al-Imāma fi al-Islam. Dār al-Kātib al-ᶜArabi (Baghdad, n.d.)

"Shihāb al-Dīn Abī Firās" in the Journal, al-Hikma, (1956) 38-44.

Tisdall, W. St. Clair
"Shīᶜah additions to the Koran" MW 3 (1913) pp.227-41.

Tritton, A.S.
"Notes on some Ismāᶜīlī Manuscripts" BSOS 7 (1933 - 35).

Tucker, William F.
"Abu Manṣūr al-Ijlī and the Manṣūrīya : a study in Medieval terrorism"
Der Islam, 54/1 (1977) pp.66-76.

"Bayān b. Samᶜān and the Bayānīya : Shīᶜite Extremists of Umayyad Iraq" MW 65/4 (1975) pp. 241-53.

"Rebels and Gnostics : al-Mughira ibn Saᶜīd and the Mughīrīya"
Arabica 22/1 (1975) 33-47.

Tyan E.
"Djihād" in EI²

U. Rubin
"Pre existence and Light, Aspects of the Concept of Nur Muhammad"
Israel Oriental Studies V (Jerusalem, Tel Aviv University, 1975) pp.62-119.

"Prophets and Progenitors in Early ShīCa Tradition
JSAI I (1979)

Vaglieri, V.
"Ali", "Fadak", "Fāṭima" and "Ghadīr Khumm" in EI²

Van Arendonk C.
Le Dẽbuts de L'Imamat Zaidite du Yemen
(Leyde, 1960).

Wadad al-Qādī
al-Kaysānīya fi Ta'rīkh wa al-Adab
(Beirut, 1974).

Watt, W.M.
The Formative Period of Islamic Thought
Edinburgh University Press and Aldine Publishing Company
(Edinburgh and Chicago, 1973).

Islam and its Integration of Society
(London, 1961).

Islamic Philosophy and Theology,
Edinburgh University Press, paperback edition
(Edinburgh, 1979).

Islamic Political Thought
Edinburgh University Press, paperback edition.
(Edinburgh, 1980).

Muhammad at Mecca
(Oxford, 1953)

Muhammad at Medina
(Oxford, 1955).

"Khārijite Thought in the Umayyad Period".
Der Islam, 36, pt.3 (1961).

"The Muslim Yearning for a Saviour : Aspects of Early ᶜAbbāsid Shīᶜism" The Saviour God, ed. S.G.F. Brandon; (Oxford, 1963).

"The Political Attitudes of the Muᶜtazilah'
JRAS (1963) pp. 38-57.

"The Rāfidites : A Preliminary Study"
Oriens XVI (1963).

"Shīᶜism under the Umayyads"
JRAS (1960).

Wellhausen, Julius
The Arab Kingdom and its Fall, English translation by Margaret G. Weir,
(Calcutta, 1927).

Die religios - politischen opposition sparteien im alten Islam,
(Gottingen, 1901) Eng. translation under the title : The Religio - Political Factions in Early Islam ed. R.C. Ostle, translated by R.C. Ostle and S.M. Walzer
(Netherlands, 1975).

Wensinck, A.J.
Concordance et indices de la Tradition musulmane.
7 vols. E.J. Brill, (Leiden, 1936-69).

A Handbook of Early Muhammadan Tradition (Leiden, 1960).

The Muslim Creed, Cambridge University Press, (Cambridge, 1932).

EI EI^2 and SEI s.v. "Khamr", "Murjia", "Nabīdh", "Ḳunūt".